arXiv:1512.03327v1 [math.DS] 10 Dec 2015

NONRIGIDITY FOR CIRCLE HOMEOMORPHISMS WITH SEVERAL BREAK POINTS

ABDELHAMID ADOUANI AND HABIB MARZOUGUI

Abstract. Let f and g be two class P-homeomorphisms of the circle S^1 with break points singularities, that are differentiable maps except at some singular points where the derivative has a jump. Assume that the derivatives Df and Dg are absolutely continuous on every continuity interval of Df and Dg respectively. Denote by $C(f)$ the set of break points of f. For $c \in S^1$, denote by $\pi_{s,O_f(c)}(f)$ the product of $f-$ jumps in break points lying to the $f-$ orbit of c and by $\mathrm{SO}(f) = \{O_f(c) : \ c \in C(f) \text{ and } \pi_{s,O_f(c)}(f) \neq 1\}$, called the set of singular f-orbits. The maps f and g are called break-equivalent if there exists a topological conjugating h such that $h(\mathrm{SO}(f)) = \mathrm{SO}(g)$ and $\pi_{s,O_g(h(c))}(g) = \pi_{s,O_f(c)}(f)$ for all $c \in \mathrm{SO}(f)$. Assume that f and g have the same irrational rotation number of bounded type. We prove that if f and g are not break-equivalent, then any topological conjugating h between f and g is a singular function i.e. it is a continuous on S^1, but $\mathrm{Dh}(x) = 0$ a.e. with respect to the Lebesgue measure. As a consequence if for some point $d \in \mathrm{SO}(f)$, $\pi_{s,O_g(d)}(g) \notin \{\pi_{s,O_f(c)}(f) : c \in C(f)\}$, then the homeomorphism conjugation h is a singular function. This later result generalizes previous results for one and two break points obtained by Dzhalilov-Akin-Temir and Akhadkulov-Dzhalilov-Noorani. Moreover, if f and g do not have the same number of singular orbits then the homeomorphism conjugating f to g is a singular function. We also deduce that under the case of rotation number of bounded type that if f does not have the (D)-property (i.e. $\pi_{s,O_f(c)}(f) = 1$, for all $c \in C(f)$) and g has the (D)-property, then the map conjugating f to g is a singular function. In particular, if f does not have the (D)-property with rotation number of bounded type, then the invariant measure μ_f is singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Theses results cannot be extended to rotation number not of bounded type even for piecewise linear homeomorphisms (see very recently, an example due to Teplinsky in [25]).

1. Introduction

Denote by $S^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ the circle and $p : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow S^1$ the canonical projection. Let f be an orientation preserving homeomorphism of S^1. The homeomorphism f admits a lift $\widehat{f} : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is an increasing homeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}$ such that $p \circ \widehat{f} = f \circ p$. Conversely, the projection of such a homeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}$ is an orientation preserving homeomorphism of S^1. Let $x \in S^1$. We call *orbit* of x by f the subset $O_f(x) = \{f^n(x) : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Historically, the study of the dynamics of circle homeomorphisms was initiated by Poincaré ([23], 1886), who introduced the rotation number of a homeomorphism f of S^1 as $\rho(f) = \lim\limits_{n\to+\infty} \frac{\widehat{f}^n(\widehat{x})-\widehat{x}}{n} \pmod 1$, where $\widehat{x} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $p(\widehat{x}) = x$. Poincaré shows that this limit exists and does not depend on neither x nor the lift $\widehat{f}$ of f. We say that f is semi-conjugate to the rotation $R_{\rho(f)}$ if there exists an orientation preserving surjective continuous map $h : S^1 \longrightarrow S^1$ of degree one such that $h \circ f = R_{\rho(f)} \circ h$.

Poincaré's theorem. Let f be an homeomorphism of S^1 with irrational rotation number $\rho(f)$. Then f is semi-conjugate to the rotation $R_{\rho(f)}$.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 37E10; Secondary 37C15

Key words : homeomorphism, class P-homeomorphism, rotation number, conjugation, break-point, jump, singular measure, singular function, break-equivalent.

A natural question is whether the semi-conjugation h could be improved to be a conjugation, that is h to be an homeomorphism. In this case, we say that f is topologically conjugate to the rotation $R_{\rho(f)}$. In this direction, Denjoy ([10]) proves the following:

Denjoy's theorem [10]. Every C^2-diffeomorphism f of S^1 with irrational rotation number $\rho(f)$ is topologically conjugate to the rotation $R_{\rho(f)}$.

Denjoy asked whether or not C^2-diffeomorphisms f of S^1 are ergodic with respect to the Lebesgue measure m (f is said to be ergodic with respect to m if any f-invariant measurable set A has measure $m(A)$ equal to 0 or 1). Simultaneously, Herman and Katok gave a positive answer to this question:

Herman-Katok's theorem ([17], [14]). Every C^2-diffeomorphism f with irrational rotation number is ergodic with respect to the Lebesgue measure m.

It is well known that an homeomorphism f of S^1 with irrational rotation number preserves a unique normalized measure on S^1, denoted by μ_f. If $\widehat{h}$ is the lift of h, by taking $\widehat{h}(0) = 0$, the conjugating homeomorphism h is unique and related to μ_f by $h(x) = p(\mu_f([0, x])) \in S^1$ for $x \in S^1$. Uniqueness of μ_f implies that μ_f is either singular, or absolutely continuous with respect to m, in this second case, h is an absolutely continuous function. Recall that μ_f is said to be *singular* with respect to the Lebesgue measure m on S^1 if there exists a measurable subset E of S^1 such that $\mu_f(E) = 1$ and $m(E) = 0$. In fact, if μ_f is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure m and f is a C^2-diffeomorphism, μ_f is necessarily equivalent to m as a consequence of Herman-Katok's theorem above (i.e. m is absolutely continuous with respect to μ_f and conversely). In the sequel we deote by $\mathbb{R}^* = \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$ and $\mathbb{N}^* = \mathbb{N}\backslash\{0\}$.

Definition. A real number $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ is called *Diophantine with exponent* $\delta \geq 0$ if there is a constant $c(\alpha) > 0$ such that

$$|\alpha - \frac{p}{q}| \geq \frac{c(\alpha)}{q^{2+\delta}} \qquad \text{for any } \frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q}. \tag{1}$$

A number that is neither rational nor Diophantine is called a *Liouville number.*
Every real number $\alpha \in]0, 1[$ has a continued fraction expansion represented by

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{a_1 + \frac{1}{a_2 + \ldots}} := [a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n, \ldots]$$

where $a_m \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ are called *partial quotients* of α. When $(a_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, α is said to be of *bounded type.* This is equivalent to the fact that (1) holds with $\delta = 0$.

The problem of smoothness of the conjugacy h of smooth diffeomorphisms to rotations is now very well understood (see for instance [16], [17], [18], [19], [26]).

We refer the reader to the books [22] and [9] for a thorough account on circle homeomorphisms.

The situation is more complicated for circle homeomorphisms with break points or shortly, class P-homeomorphisms (see the definition below). This class are known to satisfy the conclusion of Denjoy's theorem (Corollary 2.6) (see also [17]; [16], chapter VI) and, with additional regularity, of Herman-Katok's theorem (see [6]). However, Katznelson-Ornstein's theorem [17] cannot be extended in general to class P. The study of the regularity of the invariant measures of class P-homeomorphisms arises then naturally.

Class P-homeomorphisms
The following definition is du to M.R. Herman.

Definition 1.1. (see [16], p.74) An orientation preserving homeomorphism f of S^1 is called a *class P*-homeomorphism if it is differentiable except at finitely many points, the so called *break points* of f, at which left and right derivatives (denoted, respectively, by Df_- and Df_+) exist and such that the derivative $\mathrm{Df} : S^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^*$ has the following properties:

- there exist two constants $0 < a < b < +\infty$ such that: $a < \mathrm{Df}(x) < b$, for every x, where Df exists,
- $a < \mathrm{Df}_+(c) < b$ and $a < \mathrm{Df}_-(c) < b$ at the break points c.
- $\log \mathrm{Df}$ has bounded variation on S^1.

We pointed out that the third condition implies the two ones. The ratio $\sigma_f(c) := \dfrac{\mathrm{Df}_-(c)}{\mathrm{Df}_+(c)}$ is called the *f-jump* in c.

Denote by

- $C(f) = \{c_0, c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_p\}$ the set of break points of f in S^1
- $c_{p+1} := c_0$.
- $\pi_{s,O_f(c)}(f) := \prod_{x \in C(f) \cap O_f(c)} \sigma_f(x)$, for every $c \in S^1$.
- $\pi_s(f)$ the product of f-jumps in the break points of f:

$$\pi_s(f) = \prod_{c \in C(f)} \sigma_f(c).$$

- $SO(f) = \{O_f(c) : \ c \in C(f) \text{ and } \pi_{s,O_f(c)}(f) \neq 1\}$

The total variation of $\log \mathrm{Df}$ we denote by $V = \mathrm{Var}(\log \mathrm{Df})$. We have

$$V := \sum_{j=0}^{p} \mathrm{Var}_{[c_j, c_{j+1}]} \log \mathrm{Df} + |\log(\sigma_f(c_j))| < +\infty.$$

In this case, V is the total variation of $\log \mathrm{Df}$, $\log \mathrm{Df}_-$, $\log \mathrm{Df}_+$.

We notice the following properties:

- If f is a class P-homeomorphism of S^1 which is C^1 on S^1 then f is a C^1-diffeomorphism.
- If f is a class P-homeomorphism of S^1 then $D^2 f \in L^1(S^1)$: Indeed, this follows from ([15], Theorem 18.14, p. 284) since Df has bounded variation on S^1.
- If f is a class P-homeomorphism of S^1 and Df is absolutely continuous on every connected interval of $S^1 \backslash C(f)$ then $f \in C^1(S^1 \backslash C(f))$.

Among the simplest examples of class P-homeomorphisms, there are:

- C^2-diffeomorphisms,
- Piecewise linear PL-homeomorphisms.

An orientation preserving homeomorphism f of S^1 is called a *PL-homeomorphism* if f is differentiable except at finitely many break points $(c_i)_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ of S^1 such that the derivative Df is constant on each $]c_i,\ c_{i+1}[$.

Denote by

- $\mathcal{P}(S^1)$ the set of class P-homeomorphisms of S^1.
- $\mathrm{PL}(S^1)$ the set of orientation preserving piecewise linear PL-homeomorphisms of S^1.

We notice that $\mathcal{P}(S^1)$ is a group which contains $\mathrm{PL}(S^1)$ (cf. [1]).

Definition 1.2. [3] Let $f \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$. We say that f has the *(D)-property* if the product of f-jumps at the break points of each orbit is trivial, that is $\pi_{s,O_f(c)}(f) = 1$, for every $c \in C(f)$.

In particular, if f has the (D)-property, then $\pi_s(f) = 1$. Conversely, if all break points belong to the same orbit and $\pi_s(f) = 1$ then f has the (D)-property.

Let $f \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$. We say that f satisfies the *Katznelson-Ornstein (KO)* if Df is absolutely continuous on every continuity interval of Df.

• Recently, there has been a significant progress in the problem of the regularity of the conjugating map between two class P-homeomorphisms with the *same* irrational rotation number. The case of two class P-homeomorphisms with one break point and with the same jump, was studied by Khanin and Khmelev in [21] and by Teplinskii and Khanin in [20].

• The case of two class P-homeomorphisms with *one* break point and with *distinct* jumps, was studied by Dzhalilov, Akin and Temir in [11]. Their results show that the conjugation map between two such maps is singular.

• The case of two class P-homeomorphisms with *two* break points was studied by Akhadkulov, Dzhalilov and Mayer in [7] (see Corollary 1.6).

• The case of *several* break point with *distinct total jumps*, was studied by Dzhalilov, Mayer and Safarov in [12], and independently by the first author in [4]. Their results show that the conjugation map between two such maps is singular:

Theorem ([4], [12]) *Let f and g be two class P-homeomorphisms of the circle S^1 and same irrational rotation number. Assume that f and g satisfy that satisfy the Katznelson-Ornstein (KO). If $\pi_s(f) \neq \pi_s(g)$ then the homeomorphism map h conjugating f and g is a singular function i.e. it is continuous on S^1 and $Dh(x) = 0$ a.e. with respect to the Lebesgue measure.*

Definition 1.3. We say that two class P-homeomorphisms f and g of the circle S^1 are *break-equivalent* if there exists a topological conjugating h such that

(1) $h(\mathrm{SO}(f)) = \mathrm{SO}(g)$ and
(2) $\pi_{s,O_g(h(c))}(g) = \pi_{s,O_f(c)}(f)$, for all $c \in C(f)$

In particular, if all points of $C(f)$ (resp. $C(g)$) are on pairwise distinct orbits then
- $\mathrm{card}(\mathrm{SO}(f)) = \mathrm{card}(C(f))$ (resp. $\mathrm{card}(\mathrm{SO}(g)) = \mathrm{card}(C(g))$),
- f and g are break-equivalent if there exists a topological conjugation h from f to g such that:
(1) $h(C(f)) = C(g)$ and
(2) $\sigma_g(h(c)) = \sigma_f(c)$ for all $c \in C(f)$.

This definition coincides with that of [8]. It is easy to see that if there is a C^1- conjugation between f and g then f and g are break-equivalent. The case of break-equivalent $C^{2+\alpha}$ homeomorphisms f and g with $\pi_s(f) = \pi_s(g) = 1$ and some combinatorial conditions was study by Cunha-Smania in [8]. It was proved that any two such homeomorphisms are C^1- conjugated.

In the present paper we consider *non break equivalent* class P-homeomorphisms having *several break points* with coinciding irrational rotation number of bounded type. The main purpose is to prove the following:

Main Theorem (Nonrigidity). *Let f and g be two class P-homeomorphisms of the circle S^1 with*

several break points that satisfy the Katznelson-Ornstein (KO) and they have the same irrational rotation number of bounded type. If f and g are not break equivalent then the homeomorphism h conjugating f to g is a singular function i.e. it is continuous on S^1 and $Dh(x) = 0$ a.e. with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

As a consequence we have

Corollary 1.4. *Let f and g satisfy the assumptions of the main theorem. If card $(SO(f)) \neq$ card $(SO(g))$ then the map conjugating f to g is a singular function. In particular, this hold if f (resp. g) has exactly n break points (resp. m break points) lying on pairwise distinct f-orbits (resp. g-orbits) with $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \neq m$.*

Corollary 1.5. *Let f and g satisfy the assumptions of the main theorem. If there is some point $d \in SO(f)$ such that $\pi_{s,O_g(d)}(g) \notin \{\pi_{s,O_{f(c)}}(f) : \ c \in C(f)\}$ then the map h conjugating f to g is singular.*

In particular, for *non break equivalent* homeomorphisms with two break points, we get, as consequence:

Corollary 1.6. (*Akhadkulov-Dzhalilov-Noorani's theorem*) [5] *Let $f_i \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$, $i = 1, 2$ be circle homeomorphisms with two break points a_i, b_i. Assume that f_i, $i = 1, 2$ satisfy the Katznelson-Ornstein (KO) condition and $D^2 f_i \in L^p(S^1)$ for some $p > 1$. Assume that:*

(i) *The rotation numbers $\rho(f_i)$ of f_i, $i = 1, 2$ are irrational of bounded type and coincide $\rho(f_1) = \rho(f_2) = \rho$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\mathbb{Q}$,*
(ii) $\sigma_{f_1}(a_1) \notin \{\sigma_{f_2}(a_2), \ \sigma_{f_2}(b_2)\}$,
(iii) $\sigma_{f_1}(a_1) \ \sigma_{f_1}(b_1) = \sigma_{f_1}(a_2) \ \sigma_{f_1}(b_2)$,
(iv) *The break points of f_i, $i = 1, 2$ do not lie on the same orbit,*

Then the map h conjugating f_1 to f_2 is singular.

Corollary 1.7. *Let f and g satisfy the assumptions of the main theorem. Then:*

(i) *If g does not have the $(D)-$ property and f has the $(D)-$ property then the map conjugating f to g is singular.*
(ii) *If f and g have the $(D)-$property and $D^2 f$, $D^2 g \in L^p(S^1)$ for some $p > 1$ then the map conjugating f to g is absolutely continuous.*

In particular:

Corollary 1.8. (*Adouani-Marzougui's theorem* ([2], *Theorem B*)) *Let f satisfies the assumptions of the main theorem. Then:*

(i) *If f does not have the (D)-property then the invariant measure μ_f is singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure m.*
(ii) *If f has the (D)-property and $D^2 f \in L^p(S^1)$ for some $p > 1$, then the measure μ_f is equivalent to the Lebesgue measure m.*

Corollary 1.9. ([2], *Corollary 1.5*) *Let $f \in \mathrm{PL}(S^1)$ have irrational rotation number α of bounded type. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) *f has the (D)-property*
(ii) *The measure μ_f is equivalent to the Lebesgue measure m.*

Remark. The main Theorem and in particular Corollary 1.9 cannot be extended to rotation number not of bounded type, since very recently, Teplinsky [25] constructs an example of a (PL) circle homeomorphism with 4 non-trivial break points lying on different orbits that has invariant measure equivalent to the Lebesgue measure m. The rotation number for such example can be chosen either Diophantine or Liouvillean, but not of bounded type.

2. Notations and preliminary results

2.1. Dynamical partitions. Let f be a homeomorphism of S^1 with irrational rotation number $\alpha = \rho(f)$. We identify α to its lift $\widehat{\alpha}$ in $]0,1[$. Let $(a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}^*}$ be the partial quotients of α in the continued fractions expansion. For $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the fractions $[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n]$ are written in the form of irreducible fractions $\frac{p_n}{q_n}$. The sequence $\frac{p_n}{q_n}$ converges to α and we say that $\frac{p_n}{q_n}$ are *rational approximations* of α. Their denominators q_n satisfy the following recursion relation:

$$q_n = a_n q_{n-1} + q_{n-2},\ n \geq 2,\ q_0 = 1,\ q_1 = a_1.$$

Let $x_0 \in S^1$ fixed. Denote by:

$$\Delta_0^{(n)}(x_0) = \begin{cases} [x_0, f^{q_n}(x_0)], & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ [f^{q_n}(x_0), x_0], & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

$$\Delta_i^{(n)}(x_0) := f^i\left(\Delta_0^{(n)}(x_0)\right),\ i \in \mathbb{Z}$$

In all the sequel, we deal with the case n odd (the case n even is obtained by reversing the orientation of S^1).

We have then:

Lemma 2.1 (See [24])**.** *The segments $\Delta_i^{(n-1)}(x_0) = f^i\left(\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(x_0)\right),\ 0 \leq i < q_n$ and $\Delta_j^{(n)}(x_0) = f^j\left(\Delta_0^{(n)}(x_0)\right),\ 0 \leq j < q_{n-1}$ cover S^1 and that their interiors are mutually disjoint.*

The partition denoted by $\xi_n(x_0) := \left\{\Delta_i^{(n-1)}(x_0);\ \Delta_j^{(n)}(x_0),\ 0 \leq i < q_n,\ 0 \leq j < q_{n-1}\right\}$ is called the *n-th dynamical partition* of the point x_0. It is defined by the order of points $x_0, \dots, f^{q_{n-1}+q_n-1}(x_0)$. The process of passing from $\xi_n(x_0)$ to $\xi_{n+1}(x_0)$ is described by remaining intact the elements $\Delta_j^{(n)}(x_0)$, while each element $\Delta_i^{(n-1)}(x_0)$, $(0 \leq i < q_n)$ is partitioned into $a_{n+1}+1$ sub-segments; since $q_{n+1} = a_{n+1}q_n + q_{n-1}$:

$$\Delta_i^{(n-1)}(x_0) = \Delta_i^{(n+1)}(x_0) \ \cup \bigcup_{s=0}^{a_{n+1}-1} \Delta_{i+q_{n-1}+sq_n}^{(n)}(x_0)$$

For every $n \geq 1$, $\xi_{n+1}(x_0)$ is finer than $\xi_n(x_0)$ in the following sense: every element $\xi_n(x_0)$ is a union of elements $\xi_{n+1}(x_0)$.

The following lemmas are easy to check.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer and $y_1 \in S^1$. Set $y_2 = f^{q_{n-1}}(y_1)$, $y_3 = f^{q_{n-1}}(y_2)$, $\Delta_i^{(n-1)}(y_1) = f^i([y_1, y_2])$ and $\Delta_j^{(n-1)}(y_2) = f^j([y_2, y_3])$, $0 \leq i,\ j < q_n$. Then $\Delta_i^{(n-1)}(y_1) \cap \Delta_j^{(n-1)}(y_2)$ has non empty interior if and only if one of the following conditions holds:*

(1) $j = i - q_{n-1}$ *and* $q_{n-1} \leq i < q_n$*; in this case we have*

$$\Delta_i^{(n-1)}(y_1) = \Delta_j^{(n-1)}(y_2).$$

(2) $j = q_n - q_{n-1} + i$ *and* $0 \leq i < q_{n-1}$*; in this case we have*

$$\Delta_j^{(n-1)}(y_2) = f^{q_n}(\Delta_i^{(n-1)}(y_1)).$$

Lemma 2.3. *Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer and $y_1 \in S^1$. Set $y_2 = f^{q_{n-1}}(y_1)$, $y_3 = f^{q_{n-1}}(y_2)$. Then for every $x \in S^1 \backslash O_f(y_1)$, there exists a unique $0 \leq i = i_n(x) < q_n$ such that $x \in f^i(]y_1, y_2[) \cup f^{\varphi_n(i)}(]y_2, y_3[)$ where $\varphi_n : [0, q_n[\longrightarrow [0, q_n[$ is a bijective map given by:*

$$\varphi_n(i) = \begin{cases} q_n - q_{n-1} + i, & \text{if } \ 0 \leq i < q_{n-1} \\ i - q_{n-1}, & \text{if } \ q_{n-1} \leq i < q_n \end{cases}$$

2.2. Useful inequalities. The proof of the following results are based on the dynamical partition of S^1.

Finzi distortion Lemma [13]. Let $f \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ with irrational rotation number. For all $z \in S^1$; $x,\ y \in [z,\ f^{q_{n-1}}(z)]$ and for all integer $0 \leq k \leq q_n$, we have:

$$e^{-V} \leq \frac{\mathrm{Df}^k(x)}{\mathrm{Df}^k(y)} \leq e^V.$$

Notice that Finzi distortion Lemma is used for the proof of Herman-Katok's theorem.

The following Lemma plays a key role for studying metrical properties of the homeomorphism f:

Denjoy's inequality. Let $f \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ with irrational rotation number. For all $x \in S^1$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$e^{-V} \leq \mathrm{Df}^{q_n}(x) \leq e^V$$

where $V = \mathrm{Var}(\log \mathrm{Df})$.

The proof of this inequality results from Finzi distortion Lemma. It can be also obtained by applying Denjoy-Koksma's inequality to the fonction $\log \mathrm{Df}$ (cf. Herman [16]).

Here and further on, by $m([a, b])$ we mean the smallest length of the two arcs $[a, b]$ and $[b, a]$ on S^1.

Using Denjoy's inequality, one has:

Corollary 2.4 (Geometric inequality)**.** *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $x_0 \in S^1$, $n \geq 1$ and any element $\Delta^{(n)}$ of the dynamical partition $\xi_n(x_0)$, we have $m(\Delta^{(n)}) \leq C\lambda^n$, where $\lambda = (1 + e^{-V})^{-\frac{1}{2}} < 1$.*

From Corollary 2.4 it follows that every orbit of every $x \in S^1$ is dense in S^1 and this implies the following generalization of the classical Denjoy theorem:

Corollary 2.5 (Denjoy's theorem: the class P)**.** *Let $f \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ with irrational rotation number $\alpha = \rho(f)$. Then f is topologically conjugate to the rotation R_α.*

In the following Lemma we have to compare the lengths of iterates different of intervals.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $f \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ with irrational rotation number $\alpha = \rho(f)$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $z_1 \in S^1$. Set $z_2 = f^{q_{n-1}}(z_1)$, $z_3 = f^{q_{n-1}}(z_2)$. Then for any segments $K_1,\ K_2 \subset [z_1, z_3]$, one has:*

$$e^{-2V}\frac{m(K_1)}{m(K_2)} \leq \frac{m(f^j(K_1))}{m(f^j(K_2))} \leq e^{2V}\frac{m(K_1)}{m(K_2)}$$

for all $j = -q_n, \ldots, 0, \ldots, q_n$.

Proof. If $j = q_n$, Lemma 2.6 is a consequence of Denjoy's inequality. We suppose that $0 \leq j < q_n$. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the set of segments in $[z_1, z_2]$ or in $[z_2, z_3]$. If $K \in \mathcal{L}$ then $K \subset [z, f^{q_{n-1}}(z)]$ with $z = z_1$ or $z = z_2$.

Since

$$\frac{m(f^j(K))}{\mathrm{Df}^j(z_2)} = \int_K \frac{\mathrm{Df}^j(t)}{\mathrm{Df}^j(z_2)} dm(t),$$

by Finzi distortion Lemma applied to f on $[z, f^{q_{n-1}}(z)]$, we get:

$$e^{-V} \leq \frac{\mathrm{Df}^j(t)}{\mathrm{Df}^j(z_2)} \leq e^V, \quad \text{for every} \quad t \in K.$$

By integrate this last inequality, we obtain

$$e^{-V} m(K) \leq \frac{m(f^j(K))}{\mathrm{Df}^j(z_2)} \leq e^V m(K) \tag{2.1}$$

Let $K_1,\ K_2 \subset [z_1, z_3]$ be two segments. We distinguish three cases:

a) $K_1 \in \mathcal{L}$ and $K_2 \in \mathcal{L}$: in this case, the inequality (2.1) implies:

$$e^{-V} m(K_1) \leq \frac{m(f^j(K_1))}{\mathrm{Df}^j(z_2)} \leq e^V m(K_1)$$

and

$$e^{-V} m(K_2) \leq \frac{m(f^j(K_2))}{\mathrm{Df}^j(z_2)} \leq e^V m(K_2),$$

therefore

$$e^{-2V}\frac{m(K_1)}{m(K_2)} \leq \frac{m(f^j(K_1))}{m(f^j(K_2))} \leq e^{2V}\frac{m(K_1)}{m(K_2)}.$$

b) $K_1 \notin \mathcal{L}$ and $K_2 \in \mathcal{L}$: in this case, take $K_1 = K_1' \cup K_1''$ where $K_1' \subset [z_1, z_2]$ and $K_1'' \subset [z_2, z_4]$ are two segments, then $K_1' \in \mathcal{L}$ and $K_1'' \in \mathcal{L}$. By a), we see that

$$e^{-2V}\frac{m(K_1')}{m(K_2)} \leq \frac{m(f^j(K_1'))}{m(f^j(K_2))} \leq e^{2V}\frac{m(K_1')}{m(K_2)}$$

and

$$e^{-2V}\frac{m(K_1'')}{m(K_2)} \leq \frac{m(f^j(K_1''))}{m(f^j(K_2))} \leq e^{2V}\frac{m(K_1'')}{m(K_2)}.$$

Adding these inequalities, we get

$$e^{-2V}\frac{m(K_1)}{m(K_2)} \leq \frac{m(f^j(K_1))}{m(f^j(K_2))} \leq e^{2V}\frac{m(K_1)}{m(K_2)}.$$

c) $K_1 \notin \mathcal{L}$ and $K_2 \notin \mathcal{L}$: in this case, take $K_2 = K_2' \cup K_2''$ where $K_2' \subset [z_1, z_2]$ and $K_2'' \subset [z_2, z_3]$ are two segments. By applying b) to K_1 and K_2' (resp. K_2''), we obtain the inequality of the Lemma. Apply the same result to f^{-1} instead of f (since the convergent sequences of the continued fractions of $\varrho(f^{-1}) = 1 - \varrho(f)$ and $\varrho(f)$ have the same denominators). □

2.3. Some ratio tools. Let us introduce the notion of ratio distortion with respect to a homeomorphism.

Definition 2.7. Let x_1, x_2, x_3 be real numbers such that $x_1 < x_2 < x_3$.

i) The *ratio* of the triple (x_1, x_2, x_3) is the real number defined as

$$\mathrm{r}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \frac{x_2 - x_1}{x_3 - x_2}.$$

ii) The *ratio distortion* of the triple (x_1, x_2, x_3) with respect to a strictly increasing function $F : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the real number defined as

$$\mathrm{Dr}_F(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \frac{\mathrm{r}(F(x_1), F(x_2), F(x_3))}{r(x_1, x_2, x_3)} = \frac{F(x_2) - F(x_1)}{x_2 - x_1}\frac{x_3 - x_2}{F(x_3) - F(x_2)}$$

Notice that:

- The ratio r is translation invariant:

$$\mathrm{r}(x_1 + a, x_2 + a, x_3 + a) = \mathrm{r}(x_1, x_2, x_3),\ a \in \mathbb{R}.$$

- The ratio distortion Dr is multiplicative with respect to composition: for two functions F and G on $\mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\mathrm{Dr}_{G\circ F}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \mathrm{Dr}_G(F(x_1), F(x_2), F(x_3))\mathrm{Dr}_F(x_1, x_2, x_3).$$

Let $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in S^1$ with lifts $\widehat{z_1},\ \widehat{z_2},\ \widehat{z_3}$ and $z_1 \prec z_2 \prec z_3 \prec z_1$ ordered on S^1. Define

$$\widetilde{z_i} := \begin{cases} \widehat{z_i}, & \text{if } \ \widehat{z_1} < \widehat{z_i} < 1 \\ 1 + \widehat{z_i}, & \text{if } \ 0 \leq \widehat{z_i} < \widehat{z_1} \end{cases}$$

where $i = 2, 3$. Obviously we have $\widetilde{z_1} < \widetilde{z_2} < \widetilde{z_3}$. The vector $(\widetilde{z_1}, \widetilde{z_2}, \widetilde{z_3}) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is called the *lifted vector* of $(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in (S^1)^3$.

Consider now a homeomorphism f of S^1 with lift $\widehat{f}$. We define the *ratio distortion* of the triple (z_1, z_2, z_3), $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in S^1$ with respect to f by

$$\mathrm{Dr}_f(z_1, z_2, z_3) := \mathrm{Dr}_{\widehat{f}}(\widetilde{z_1}, \widetilde{z_2}, \widetilde{z_3})$$

where $(\widetilde{z_1}, \widetilde{z_2}, \widetilde{z_3})$ is the lifted vector of (z_1, z_2, z_3). This definition is independent of the lift of f since the ratio is translation invariant.

Definition 2.8. Let $R > 1$ be a real number and $x_0 \in S^1$. We say that a triple (z_1, z_2, z_3) of S^1 $(z_1 \prec z_2 \prec z_3)$ satisfies the conditions (a) and (b) for the point x_0 and the constant R if:

$$(a) : R^{-1} \leq \frac{m([z_2,\ z_3])}{m([z_1,\ z_2])} \leq R$$

$$(b) : \max_{1\leq i\leq 3} m([x_0, z_i]) \leq Rm([z_1, z_2])$$

We call two intervals in S^1 *R-comparable* if the ratio of their lenghts is in $[R^{-1}, R]$.

2.4. Reduction. In this subsection, we will reduce any homeomorphism $f \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ with several break (or non-break) points to the one with break points lying on different orbits.

Definition 2.9. Let $c \in C(f)$. A *maximal f-connection* of c is a segment $[f^{-p}(c), \dots, f^q(c)] := \{f^s(c) :\ -p \leq s \leq q\}$ of the orbit $O_f(c)$ which contains all the break points of f contained on $O_f(c)$ and such that $f^{-p}(c)$ (resp. $f^q(c)$) is the first (resp. last) break point of f on $O_f(c)$.

We have the following properties:

- Two break points of f are on the same maximal f-connection, if and only if, they are on the same orbit.
- Two distinct maximal f-connections are disjoint.

Denote by

- $M_i(f) = [c_i, \dots, f^{N_i}(c_i)],\ (N_i \in \mathbb{N})$, the maximal f-connections of $c_i \in C(f)$, $(0 \leq i \leq p)$.
- $\mathrm{M}(f) = \coprod_{i=0}^{p} M_i(f)$.

So, we have the decomposition: $C(f) = \coprod_{i=0}^{p} C_i(f)$ where, $C_i(f) = C(f) \cap M_i(f),\ 0 \leq i \leq p$. We also have

$$\prod_{d\in C_i(f)} \sigma_f(d) = \prod_{d\in M_i(f)} \sigma_f(d).$$

Proposition 2.10 ([3], Theorem 2.1)**.** *Let $f \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ with irrational rotation number, and let $\big(k_0, \dots, k_p\big) \in \mathbb{Z}^{p+1}$. Then there exists a piecewise quadratic homeomorphism $K \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ such that $F := K \circ f \circ K^{-1} \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ with $C(F) \subset \{K(f^{k_i}(c_i)) = F^{k_i}(K(c_i)); i = 0, 1, \dots, p\}$ and such that $\sigma_F(F^{k_i}(K(c_i))) = \pi_{s,O_f(c_i)}(f),\ i = 0, 1, \dots, p.$*

Corollary 2.11 ([3], Corollary 2.3)**.** *Let $f \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ with irrational rotation number. Suppose that f satisfies the (KO) condition. Then, there exists a piecewise quadratic homeomorphism $K \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ such that: $F = K \circ f \circ K^{-1} \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ with $C(F) \subset \{K(c_0), \dots, K(c_p)\}$, where $c_0, \dots, c_p \in C(f)$ are on pairwise distinct orbits.*

In particular, we have:

Corollary 2.12. *Let f, K and F as in Corollary 2.11.*

(i) *If f does not satisfy the (D)-property, then there exists $0 \leq i \leq p$ such that $K(c_i)$ is the unique break point of F in its orbit.*

(ii) *If f satisfies the (D)-property then F is a C^1-diffeomorphism with* DF *absolutely continuous on S^1.*

Proposition 2.13. *Let $f,\ g \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ and have the same irrational rotation number such that the break points of f (resp. g) belong to pairwise distinct f-orbits (resp. g-orbits). Let h be the conjugating homeomorphism from f to g. Then there exist an integer $q \geq p$, $c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_q$; $d_0, d_1, \ldots, d_q$ belong to pairwise distinct orbits f-orbits and g-orbits respectively such that $C(f) \subset \{c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_q\}$, $C(g) \subset \{d_0, d_1, \ldots, d_q\}$, and a homeomorphism u of S^1 such that $G := u \circ f \circ u^{-1} \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ has break points belong to pairwise distinct G-orbits and satisfies*

(i) $C(G) \subset \{u(c_i) :\ i = 0, 1, \ldots, q\}$.
(ii) $\sigma_G(u(c_i)) = \sigma_g(d_i)\ ,\ i = 0, 1, \ldots, q$.
(iii) $\pi_s(G) = \pi_s(g)$.
(iii) *h is singular if and only if so is u.*

From now on we denote by $B := \{c_0, \ldots, c_q\}$ and $c_0 = c$.

In the sequel, we may assume that $f,\ g \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ have the same irrational rotation number α and satisfy the following:

- The points of B belong to pairwise distinct $f-$ orbits.
- The break points of g belong to pairwise distinct g-orbits.
- $C(f) \subset B$.
- The maps $f,\ g$ satisfy the Katznelson-Ornstein (KO) condition.
- The conjugating h is such that $C(g) \subset h(B)$.

3. **Primary Cells**

Let $x_0 \in S^1$ and $f \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ with irrational rotation number $\alpha = \rho(f)$. Let $c \in B$ and n an odd integer. By Lemma 2.1, either $c \in \Delta^{(n-1)}_{i_n(c)}(x_0)$ for some $0 \leq i_n(c) < q_n$ or $c \in \Delta^{(n)}_{i_n(c)}(x_0)$ for some $0 \leq i_n(c) < q_{n-1}$. Set

$$y_2 = f^{-i_n(c)}(c),\ y_1 = f^{-q_{n-1}}(y_2),\ y_3 = f^{q_{n-1}}(y_2).$$

Notice that y_1, y_2 and y_3 are defined with respect to f, x_0, c and the number $i_n(c)$ depends on x_0.

Let $\delta > 0$ and $U_\delta(x_0)$ a δ-neighbourhood of x_0.

Proposition 3.1. (*cf.* [2], *Proposition 3.1*) *Under the notations above, there exists $N = N(x_0, \delta) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N$, there is a triple $(y_1, y_2, y_3) = (y_1(n), y_2(n), y_3(n))_{n \geq N}$ with the following properties:*

(c-0) (y_1, y_2, y_3) (resp. $(f^{q_n}(y_1), f^{q_n}(y_2), f^{q_n}(y_3)))_{n \geq N} \subset U_\delta(x_0)$

(c-1) $y_2 \in \Delta^{(n-1)}_0(x_0)$ or $y_2 \in \Delta^{(n)}_0(x_0)$

(c-2) $m\left(f^j([y_1,y_3])\right) \leq K\lambda^n$, *for every* $0 \leq j < q_n$, *where* $\lambda = (1+e^{-V})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ *and* K *a constant independent of* n.

(c-3) $\sum_{j=0}^{q_n-1} m\left(f^j([y_1,y_3])\right) \leq 2$

(c-4) *The triples* (y_1,y_2,y_3) *and* $(f^{q_n}(y_1), f^{q_n}(y_2), f^{q_n}(y_3))$ *satisfy conditions* (a) *and* (b) *of definition 2.8 for* x_0 *and the constant* $R = e^{3V} + e^V + 1$.

(c-5) - $f^i([y_1,\ y_3])$ *does not contain* c *for every* $0 \leq i \neq i_n(c) < q_n$.
- $f^{i_n(c)}([y_1,y_3])$ *does not contain any break point of* f *other than* c.

Definition (**primary cell**). The triple (y_1,y_2,y_3) given in Proposition 3.1 is called a *primary cell associated to* (f,x_0,c,δ,N) for the constant $R = e^{3V} + e^V + 1$.

In the sequel, set $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{n \in \mathbb{N}\ ,\ n \geq N\}$.

Let $c \in B$, $d \notin O_f(c)$ and $(y_1,y_2,y_3) := (y_1(n), y_2(n), y_3(n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ be the primary cell associated to (f,x_0,c,δ,N). By Lemma 2.3 and for every and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, denote by

$$t_n(d) = \frac{m([f^{-i_n(d)}(d), y_2])}{m([f^{j_n(d)-i_n(d)}(y_2), y_2])}$$

where $j_n(d) = \varphi_n(i_n(d))$ and $i_n(d)$ is the unique integer $0 \leq i_n(d) < q_n$ such that $d \in f^{i_n(d)}([y_1,y_2])$ or $d \in f^{j_n(d)}([y_1,y_2])$.

One always has $f^{-i_n(d)}(d) \in [f^{q_n}y_1, y_2]$. Indeed, by Lemma 2.3, there exists a unique $0 \leq i_n(d) < q_n$ such that either $d \in f^{i_n(d)}([y_1,y_2])$ or $d \in f^{j_n(d)}([y_2,y_3])$. In the first case, $f^{-i_n(d)}(d) \in [y_1,y_2]$ and in the second case, $f^{-i_n(d)}(d) \in [f^{q_n}y_1, f^{q_n}y_2] \subset [f^{q_n}y_1, y_2]$. One can write

$$t_n(d) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{m([f^{-i_n(d)}(d), y_2])}{m([y_1,y_2])}, & \text{if } q_{n-1} \leq i_n(d) < q_n \\ \\ \dfrac{m([f^{-i_n(d)}(d), y_2])}{m([f^{q_n}y_1, y_2])}, & \text{if } 0 \leq i_n(d) < q_{n-1} \end{cases}$$

Let $d \in B\backslash\{c\}$ and A be an infinite subset of $\mathbb{N}_0$. Denote by

- $T(d,A)$ the set of limit points of $(t_n(d))_{n\in A}$. Therefore $T(d,A) \subset [0,1]$.

We say that d satisfies:

- The $P_1(d,A)$-property if $T(d,A) \cap\ ]0,1[\neq \emptyset$ and for every $n \in A,\ 0 \leq i_n(d) < q_{n-1}$.
- The $P_2(d,A)$-property if $T(d,A) \cap\ ]0,1[\neq \emptyset$ and for every $n \in A,\ q_{n-1} \leq i_n(d) < q_n$.

Set

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{11}(A) &= \{d \in B\backslash\{c\} :\ \text{d satisfies the } P_1(d,A) - \text{property}\} \\ Q_{12}(A) &= \{d \in B\backslash\{c\} :\ \text{d satisfies the } P_2(d,A) - \text{property}\} \\ Q_1(A) &= Q_{11}(A) \cup Q_{12}(A) \\ Q_2(A) &= \{d \in B\backslash\{c\} : T(d,A) = \{0\}\} \\ Q_3(A) &= \{d \in B\backslash\{c\} : T(d,A) = \{1\}\} \\ Q_4(A) &= \{d \in B\backslash\{c\} : T(d,A) = \{0,1\}\} \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.2. *Assume that the rotation number $\rho(f)$ of f is of bounded type. Then for every points c, c_1 in $B(f)$, $c_1 \notin O_f(c)$, there exists an infinite subset $\mathbb{M}_{c,c_1}$ of $\mathbb{N}_0$ such that $c_1 \in Q_1(\mathbb{M}_{c,c_1})$.*

We need two lemmas.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $0 \leq k < q_{n+1} + q_n$ be an integer. Then $\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_k^{(n)}(c)$ has non empty interior if and only if $k = q_{n-1} + q_{n+1}$ or $k = q_{n-1} + jq_n$ for some $0 \leq j \leq a_{n+1}$.*

Proof. - Assume that $k = q_{n-1} + q_{n+1}$ or $k = q_{n-1} + jq_n$ for some $0 \leq j \leq a_{n+1}$. Since

$$\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(c) = \Delta_0^{(n+1)}(c) \coprod_{0 \leq j < a_{n+1}} \Delta^{(n)}_{q_{n-1}+jq_n}(c),$$

so we have

$$\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_k^{(n)}(c) = \begin{cases} \Delta_k^{(n)}(c), & \text{if } k = q_{n-1} + jq_n \text{ with } 0 \leq j < a_{n+1}, \\ [c, f^{q_{n+1}}(c)], & \text{if } k = q_{n+1}, \\ [f^{q_{n-1}+q_n+q_{n+1}}(c), f^{q_{n-1}}(c)], & \text{if } k = q_{n-1} + q_{n+1}. \end{cases}$$

In either case, $\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_k^{(n)}(c)$ has non empty interior. Conversely we distinguish two cases:

- $0 \leq k < q_{n+1}$: if $k \notin \{q_{n-1} + jq_n : \ 0 \leq j < a_{n+1}\}$, then by Lemma 2.1, $\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_k^{(n)}(c)$ has empty interior.

- $q_{n+1} \leq k < q_{n+1} + q_n$: If $k \notin \{q_{n+1}, q_{n-1} + q_{n+1}\}$, then $k = l + q_{n+1}$ with $1 \leq l < q_n$ and $l \neq q_{n-1}$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-q_{n+1}}\left(\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_k^{(n)}(c)\right) &= [f^{-q_{n+1}}(c),\ f^{-q_{n+1}+q_{n-1}}(c)] \cap \Delta_l^{(n)}(c) \\ &\subset \left(\Delta_0^{(n)}(c) \cup \Delta_0^{(n-1)}(c)\right) \cap \Delta_l^{(n)}(c) \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_k^{(n)}(c)$ has empty interior. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let $0 \leq k < (a_{n+1} + 2)q_n$ be an integer. Then $\Delta_k^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_0^{(n)}(c)$ has non empty interior if and only if $k = q_n + q_{n+1}$ or $k = jq_n$ for some $1 \leq j \leq a_{n+1} + 1$.*

Proof. We have

$$\Delta_0^{(n)}(c) \cap \Delta_k^{(n-1)}(c) = \begin{cases} \Delta_0^{(n)}(c), & \text{if } k = jq_n \text{ with } \ 1 \leq j \leq a_{n+1}, \\ [f^{q_n}(c), f^{q_n+q_{n+1}}(c)], & \text{if } k = (a_{n+1} + 1)q_n, \\ [f^{q_n+q_{n+1}}(c), c], & \text{if } k = q_n + q_{n+1}. \end{cases}$$

Hence $\Delta_0^{(n)}(c) \cap \Delta_k^{(n-1)}(c)$ has non empty interior. Conversely, we distinguish three cases:

- $0 \leq k < q_n$: In this case, by Lemma 2.1, $\Delta_k^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_0^{(n)}(c)$ has empty interior.

- $q_n \leq k < (a_{n+1} + 1)q_n$: If $k \notin \{jq_n : \ 1 \leq j \leq a_{n+1}\}$, then $k = l + jq_n$ with $1 \leq l < q_n$ and $1 \leq j \leq a_{n+1}$. Thus we have

$$f^{-jq_n}\left(\Delta_k^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_0^{(n)}(c)\right) = \Delta_l^{(n-1)}(c) \cap f^{-jq_n}(\Delta_0^{(n)}(c)) \subset \Delta_l^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_0^{(n-1)}(c),$$

so $\Delta_k^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_0^{(n)}(c)$ has empty interior.

- $(a_{n+1}+1)q_n \leq k < (a_{n+1}+2)q_n$: If $k \notin \{(a_{n+1}+1)q_n,\ q_{n+1}+q_n\}$, then $k = l + (a_{n+1}+1)q_n$ with $1 \leq l < q_n$ and $l \neq q_{n-1}$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-(a_{n+1}+1)q_n}\left(\Delta_k^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_0^{(n)}(c)\right) &= \Delta_l^{(n-1)}(c) \cap f^{-(a_{n+1}+1)q_n}(\Delta_0^{(n)}(c)) \\ &\subset \Delta_l^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \left(\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(c) \cup f^{q_{n-1}}(\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(c))\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\Delta_k^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_0^{(n)}(c)$ has empty interior. □

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Suppose that there exist two distinct points c, c_1 in $B(f)$ such that for any infinite subset M of $\mathbb{N}_0$ we have $T(c_1, M) \subset \{0,1\}$. In particular for $M = \mathbb{N}_0$. So we have three possible cases.

Case 1: $T(c_1, \mathbb{N}_0) = \{0\}$ i.e. $c_1 \in Q_2(\mathbb{N}_0)$. Since

$$f^{-i_n(c_1)}(c_1) \in [f^{q_n}(y_1),\ y_2] = \Delta_0^{(n)}(y_1) \cup \Delta_0^{(n-1)}(y_1),$$

$$m(\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(y_1)) \leq m([f^{q_n}(y_1),\ y_2]) \leq (1+e^V)m(\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(y_1))$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{m([f^{-i_n(c_1)}(c_1),\ y_2])}{m([f^{q_n}(y_1),\ y_2])} = 0,$$

there exists an integer $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n \geq n_0,\ f^{-i_n(c_1)}(c_1) \in \Delta_0^{(n-1)}(y_1)$ and

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{m([f^{-i_n(c_1)}(c_1),\ y_2])}{m(\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(y_1))} = 0.$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$s_n := i_n(c_1) - i_n(c) - q_{n-1}$$

$$l_n := \frac{m(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n)}(c))}{m(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c))}, \quad b_n := \frac{m([c_1,\ f^{s_n+q_{n-1}}(c)])}{m(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c))}$$

Then $-q_n < s_n + q_{n-1} < q_n$ and by (Lemma 2.6 and Denjoy's inequality), we have for every $n \geq n_0,\ c_1 \in \Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c)$ and

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} b_n = 0 \tag{3.1}$$

In particular, for every $n \geq n_0$, c_1 is an interior point of $\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_{s_{n+1}}^{(n)}(c)$ and hence $\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_{s_{n+1}-s_n}^{(n)}(c)$ has a non empty interior.

- If $s_{n+1} - s_n \geq 0$, then $s_{n+1} - s_n < q_{n+1} - (q_n - q_{n-1})$ and by Lemma 3.3

$$s_{n+1} - s_n \in \{q_{n-1} + jq_n : 0 \leq j < a_{n+1}\}$$

-If $s_{n+1} - s_n \leq 0$, then $s_n - s_{n+1} < (a_{n+1}+1)q_n$ and by Lemma 3.4

$$s_{n+1} - s_n \in \{-jq_n :\ 1 \leq j \leq a_{n+1}\}.$$

Let $n \geq n_0$. Since $\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c) \subset \bigcup_{0\leq j\leq a_{n+1}} f^{q_{n-1}+jq_n}(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n)}(c))$, so by Denjoy's inequality, we have

$$\frac{m(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c))}{m(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n)}(c))} < \sum_{0\leq j\leq a_{n+1}} e^{(1+j)V}$$

So,

$$l_n^{-1} < \frac{e^V}{e^V-1}\,(e^{(1+a_{n+1})V}-1)$$

Hence,

$$\text{If } \lim_{n\to+\infty} l_n = 0 \text{ then } \lim_{n\to+\infty} a_{n+1} = +\infty \tag{3.2}$$

We distinguish four sub-cases.

Case 1.1: $s_{n+1}-s_n \in \{q_{n-1}+jq_n \ : \ 1\leq j < a_{n+1}\}$. Then by the Denjoy's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} l_n &\leq e^V \frac{m(\Delta_{s_n+q_{n-1}}^{(n)}(c))}{m(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c))} \\ &\leq e^V \frac{m([c_1,\ f^{s_n+q_{n-1}}(c)])}{m(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c))} \\ &= e^V b_n \end{aligned}$$

(since $c_1 \in \Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c)\backslash\Delta_{s_n+q_{n-1}}^{(n)}(c)$).

Case 1.2: $s_{n+1}-s_n = q_{n-1}$. Then by the Denjoy's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} l_n &\leq e^V \frac{m(\Delta_{s_{n+1}}^{(n)}(c))}{m(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c))} \\ &\leq e^V \frac{m([f^{s_{n+1}+q_n}(c),\ c_1])}{m(\Delta_{s_{n+1}}^{(n)}(c))} + e^V \frac{m([c_1,\ f^{s_n+q_{n-1}}(c)])}{m(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c))} \\ &= e^V(b_n+b_{n+1}) \end{aligned}$$

(since $c_1 \in \Delta_{s_{n+1}}^{(n)}(c) = \Delta_{s_n+q_{n-1}}^{(n)}(c) \subset \Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c)$).

Case 1.3: $s_{n+1}-s_n \in \{-jq_n \ : \ 1\leq j < a_{n+1}\}$. Then by the Denjoy's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} l_n &\leq e^V \frac{m(\Delta_{s_n+q_{n-1}}^{(n)}(c))}{m(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c))} \\ &\leq e^V \frac{m([c_1,\ f^{s_n+q_{n-1}}(c)])}{m(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c))} \\ &= e^V b_n \end{aligned}$$

(since $c_1 \in \Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c)\backslash\Delta_{s_n+q_{n-1}}^{(n)}(c)$ as in Case 1.1).

Case 1.4: $s_{n+1}-s_n = q_{n-1}-q_{n+1}$. Then by the Denjoy's iequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} l_n &= \frac{m(f^{-q_{n-1}+q_{n+1}}(\Delta^{(n)}_{s_{n+1}}(c)))}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{s_n}(c))} \\ &\leq e^{2V}\frac{m(\Delta^{(n)}_{s_{n+1}}(c))}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{s_n}(c))} \\ &\leq e^{2V}\frac{m([f^{s_{n+1}+q_n}(c),\ c_1])}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{s_n}(c))} + e^{2V}\frac{m([c_1,\ f^{s_{n+1}}(c)])}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{s_n}(c))} \\ &\leq e^{2V}\frac{m([f^{s_{n+1}+q_n}(c),\ c_1])}{m(\Delta^{(n)}_{s_{n+1}}(c))} + e^{2V}\frac{m([c_1,\ f^{s_n+q_{n-1}}(c)])}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{s_n}(c))} \\ &\leq e^{2V}(b_n + b_{n+1}) \end{aligned}$$

(since $c_1 \in \Delta^{(n)}_{s_{n+1}}(c) = f^{-q_{n+1}}(\Delta^{(n)}_{s_n+q_{n-1}}(c)) \subset \Delta^{(n-1)}_{s_n}(c)$).

In either of the four cases above, we conclude that for every $n \geq n_0$,

$$l_n \leq e^{2V}(b_n + b_{n+1}).$$

So by the assertions (3.1) and (3.2) we obtain that $\lim_{n\to+\infty} a_{n+1} = +\infty$, a contradiction with that $\rho(f)$ is of bounded type.

Case 2: $T(c_1, \mathbb{N}_0) = \{1\}$ i.e. $c_1 \in Q_3(\mathbb{N}_0)$. In this case, there exists $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_1$, $f^{-j_n(c_1)}(c_1) \in \Delta^{(n-1)}(y_2)$ and

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{m([y_2,\ f^{-j_n(c_1)}(c_1)])}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_0(y_2))} = 0.$$

For $n \geq n_1$, set

$$r_n := j_n(c_1) - i_n(c)$$

$$l'_n := \frac{m(\Delta^{(n)}_{r_n}(c))}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{r_n}(c))}, \quad b'_n := \frac{m([f^{r_n}(c),\ c_1])}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{r_n}(c))}$$

Then $-q_n < r_n < q_n$ and by Lemma 2.6, we have for every $n \geq n_1$, $c_1 \in \Delta^{(n-1)}_{r_n}(c)$ and

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} b'_n = 0$$

In particular, for every $n \geq n_1$, c_1 is an interior point of $\Delta^{(n-1)}_{r_n}(c) \cap \Delta^{(n)}_{r_{n+1}}(c)$ and

$$-q_{n+1} < r_{n+1} - r_n < q_{n+1}.$$

- If $r_{n+1} - r_n \geq 0$, then by Lemma 3.3

$$r_{n+1} - r_n \in \{q_{n-1} + jq_n : 0 \leq j < a_{n+1}\}.$$

-If $r_{n+1} - r_n \leq 0$, then by Lemma 3.4

$$r_{n+1} - r_n \in \{-jq_n : 1 \leq j \leq a_{n+1}\}.$$

We distinguish four sub-cases.

Case 2.1: $r_{n+1}-r_n \in \{q_{n-1}+jq_n:\ 0\le j<a_{n+1}-1\}$. Then by the Denjoy's inequality, we have

$$l'_n \le e^V \frac{m(f^{-q_n}(\Delta^{(n)}_{r_n}(c)))}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{r_n}(c))} \le e^V b'_n$$

(since $f^{-q_n}(\Delta^{(n)}_{r_n}(c)) \subset [f^{r_n}(c),\ c_1]$).

Case 2.2: $r_{n+1}-r_n = q_{n+1}-q_n$ (i.e. $j=a_{n+1}-1$). Then by the Denjoy's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} l'_n &= \frac{m(f^{-q_{n+1}+q_n}(\Delta^{(n)}_{r_{n+1}}(c)))}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{r_n}(c))} \\ &\le e^{2V}\frac{m(\Delta^{(n)}_{r_{n+1}}(c))}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{r_n}(c))} \\ &\le e^{2V}\left(\frac{m([f^{r_n}(c),\ c_1])}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{r_n}(c))}+\frac{m([c_1,\ f^{r_{n+1}}(c)])}{m(\Delta^{(n)}_{r_{n+1}}(c))}\right) \\ &= e^{2V}(b'_n+b'_{n+1}) \end{aligned}$$

(since $c_1 \in \Delta^{(n)}_{r_{n+1}}(c) \subset \Delta^{(n-1)}_{r_n}(c)$).

Case 2.3: $r_{n+1}-r_n \in \{-jq_n:\ 2\le j\le a_{n+1}\}$. Then by the Denjoy's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} l'_n &\le e^V \frac{m(f^{-q_n}(\Delta^{(n)}_{r_n}(c)))}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{r_n}(c))} \\ &\le e^V \frac{m([f^{r_n}(c),\ c_1])}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{r_n}(c))} \\ &= e^V b'_n \end{aligned}$$

(since $f^{-q_n}(\Delta^{(n)}_{r_n}(c)) \subset [f^{r_n}(c),\ c_1]$).

Case 2.4: $r_{n+1}-r_n = -q_n$ (i.e. $j=1$). Then by the Denjoy's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} l'_n &= \frac{m(f^{-q_n}(\Delta^{(n)}_{r_{n+1}}(c)))}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{r_n}(c))} \\ &\le e^V \frac{m(\Delta^{(n)}_{r_{n+1}}(c))}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{r_n}(c))} \\ &\le e^V \left(\frac{m([f^{r_n}(c),\ c_1])}{m(\Delta^{(n-1)}_{r_n}(c))}+\frac{m([c_1,\ f^{r_{n+1}}(c)])}{m(\Delta^{(n)}_{r_{n+1}}(c))}\right) \\ &= e^V(b'_n+b'_{n+1}) \end{aligned}$$

(since $c_1 \in \Delta^{(n)}_{r_{n+1}}(c) \subset \Delta^{(n-1)}_{r_n}(c)$).

In either of the four cases [2.1−2.4] above, we conclude that for every $n \ge n_0$,

$$l'_n \le e^{2V}(b'_n+b'_{n+1}).$$

So as in Case 1, we conclude that $\lim_{n\to+\infty} a_{n+1} = +\infty$, a contradiction with that $\rho(f)$ is of bounded type.

Case 3: $T(c_1, \mathbb{N}_0) = \{0, 1\}$. In this case, there exists an infinite subset M_1 of $\mathbb{N}_0$ such that $c_1 \in Q_2(M_1) \cap Q_3(M_2)$, where $M_2 = \mathbb{N}_0 \backslash M_1$. Hence there exists $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for all $n \geq n_1, n \in M_1$, c_1 is an interior point of $\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c)$ and there exists $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for all $n \geq n_2, n \in M_2$, c_1 is an interior point of $\Delta_{r_n}^{(n-1)}(c)$. We distinguish the following cases.

Case 3.1: $(n, n+1) \in M_1 \times M_1$ (resp. $(n, n+1) \in M_2 \times M_2$) holds for infinitely many n, say $n \in M_1' \subset M_1$ (resp. $M_2' \subset M_2$) with M_1' (resp. M_2') infinite. In this case, c_1 is an interior point of $\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_{s_{n+1}}^{(n)}(c)$ (resp. $\Delta_{r_n}^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_{r_{n+1}}^{(n)}(c)$) for $n \in M_1'$ (resp. $n \in M_2'$). Hence as in Cases 1 and 2, we obtain that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty, n\in M_1'} a_{n+1} = +\infty \text{ (resp. } \lim_{n\to+\infty, n\in M_2'} a_{n+1} = +\infty).$$

Case 3.2: $(n, n+1) \in M_1 \times M_2$ holds for infinitely many n. In this case, c_1 is an interior point of $\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_{r_{n+1}}^{(n)}(c)$. Hence we have one of the following sub-cases.

A_1: $r_{n+1} - s_n \in \{q_{n-1} + jq_n : \ 1 \leq j \leq a_{n+1}\}$. In this case, we have, by the Denjoy's inequality:

$$l_n \leq e^V \frac{m([c_1,\ f^{s_n+q_{n-1}}(c)])}{m(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c))} = e^V b_n$$

(since $f^{q_{n-1}}(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n)}(c)) \subset [c_1,\ f^{s_n+q_{n-1}}(c)]$).

A_2: $r_{n+1} - s_n \in \{-jq_n : \ 1 \leq j \leq a_{n+1} - 1\}$. In this case,

$$l_n \leq e^{3V} \frac{m([c_1,\ f^{s_n+q_{n-1}}(c)])}{m(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n-1)}(c))} = e^{3V} b_n$$

(since $f^{-(q_{n+1}-q_{n-1})}(\Delta_{s_n}^{(n)}(c)) \subset [c_1,\ f^{s_n+q_{n-1}}(c)]$).

A_3: $r_{n+1} - s_n = q_{n-1}$.

Case 3.3: $(n, n+1) \in M_2 \times M_1$ holds for infinitely many n. In this case, c_1 is an interior point of $\Delta_{r_n}^{(n-1)}(c) \cap \Delta_{s_{n+1}}^{(n)}(c)$. Hence we have one of the following sub-cases.

B_1: $s_{n+1} - r_n \in \{q_{n-1} + jq_n : \ 0 \leq j \leq a_{n+1} - 2\}$. In this case, by the Denjoy's inequality, we have

$$l_n' \leq e^{3V} b_n' \text{ (since } \ f^{q_{n+1}-q_n}(\Delta_{r_n}^{(n)}(c)) \subset [f^{r_n}(c),\ c_1]).$$

B_2: $s_{n+1} - r_n \in \{-jq_n : \ 2 \leq j \leq a_{n+1} + 1\}$. In this case, by the Denjoy's inequality, we have

$$l_n' \leq e^V b_n' \text{ (since} f^{-q_n}(\Delta_{r_n}^{(n)}(c)) \subset [f^{r_n}(c),\ c_1]).$$

B_3: $s_{n+1} - r_n = -q_n$.

Claim. One of the cases A_1, A_2, B_1 and B_2 holds for infinitely many n.

Indeed, on the contrary, the cases A_3 and B_3 hold in particular for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. So for every $n \in M_1$, we have $n+1 \in M_2$ and $r_{n+1} = s_n + q_{n-1}$ and for every $n \in M_2$, we have $n+1 \in M_1$ and $s_{n+1} - r_n = -q_n$. So for every $n \in M_1$, we have $n+1 \in M_2$, $n+2 \in M_1$ and $n+3 \in M_2$. Hence $r_{n+1} - s_{n+2} = q_{n+1}$ and $r_{n+3} - s_{n+2} = q_{n+1}$, so $r_{n+1} = r_{n+3}$, for every $n \in M_1$. Thus $(r_n)_{n\in M_2}$ is a constant $r \in \mathbb{Z}$. It follows that $c_1 \in \Delta_r^{(n-1)}(c)$ for every $n \in M_2$ and hence $m\left([f^{-r}(c_1), c]\right) \leq m\left(\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(c)\right)$. Since $\lim\limits_{n\to+\infty} m\left(\Delta_0^{(n-1)}(c)\right) = 0$, so $c_1 = f^r(c)$, this contradicts the hypothesis $c_1 \notin O_f(c)$.

If A_1 (resp. A_2) holds for infinitely many n, say $n \in M_1'' \subset M_1$ (resp. M_1''') with M_1'' (resp. M_1''') infinite, so as in Cases 1 and 2, we obtain that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty, n\in M_1''} a_{n+1} = +\infty \text{ (resp. } \lim_{n\to+\infty, n\in M_1'''} a_{n+1} = +\infty).$$

If B_1 (resp. B_2) holds for infinitely many n, say $n \in M_2'' \subset M_2$ (resp. $M_2''' \subset M_2$) with M_2'' (resp. M_2''') infinite, so similarily as for A_1 and A_2, we obtain that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty, n\in M_2''} a_{n+1} = +\infty \text{ (resp. } \lim_{n\to+\infty, n\in M_2'''} a_{n+1} = +\infty.)$$

In either of the three cases [3.1−3.3] above, we get a contradiction with that $\rho(f)$ is of bounded type. We conclude that the Case 3 doesn't occur and so $Q_4(\mathbb{N}_0) = \emptyset$. □

In the sequel, we write for simplicity $\mathbb{N}_0$ instead of $\mathbb{N}_{c,c_1}$ and we denote by

$$E(c_1, c) := \{c\} \cup Q_2(\mathbb{N}_0) \cup Q_3(\mathbb{N}_0)$$

So one has

$$B\backslash\{c\} = Q_1(\mathbb{N}_0) \ \amalg \ Q_2(\mathbb{N}_0) \ \amalg \ Q_3(\mathbb{N}_0).$$

For $a \in S^1$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\gamma > 0$, set

- $l_n := m(\Delta^{(n)}(y_1))$
- $V_{n,\gamma}^{(f)}(a) := [a - \gamma\ l_{n-1},\ a + \gamma\ l_{n-1}]$
- $k_n(d) = \begin{cases} i_n(d), & \text{if } d \in \{c\} \cup Q_2(\mathbb{N}_0) \\ j_n(d), & \text{if } d \in Q_3(\mathbb{N}_0) \end{cases}$

Proposition 3.5. *There exists a positive constant $\gamma_0 > 0$ such that:*

(1) *For every $d \in E(c_1, c)$ and every $0 < \gamma < \gamma_0$, there exists $n_\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $n \geq n_\gamma$ there exists a unique integer $0 \leq k_n(d) < q_n$ such that*

$$f^{-k_n(d)}(d) \in V_{n,\gamma}^{(f)}(f^{-i_n(c)}(c)) \subset]y_1, y_3[$$

(2) *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\bigcup\limits_{i=0}^{q_n-1} f^{-i}\big(B\backslash E(c_1, c)\big) \subset S^1\backslash V_{n,\gamma_0}^{(f)}(f^{-i_n(c)}(c))$.*

(3) *For every $d \in Q_{11}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have $f^{-i_n(d)}(d) \in]f^{q_n}(y_1) + \gamma_0 l_{n-1}, y_2 - \gamma_0 l_{n-1}[$.*

(4) *For every $d \in Q_{12}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have $f^{-j_n(d)}(d) \in]y_2 + \gamma_0 l_{n-1}, y_3 - \gamma_0 l_{n-1}[$.*

Proof. Let $d \in B\backslash\{c\}$.

Assertion (1): The intervals $f^{i_n(d)}([y_1,\ y_2])$ and $f^{j_n(d)}([y_2,\ y_3])$ are comparable (that is there is a positive constant $0 < K < 1$ such that $K \leq \dfrac{m(f^{i_n(d)}([y_1,\ y_2]))}{m(f^{j_n(d)}([y_2,\ y_3]))} \leq K^{-1}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$) and are comparable to their union $[f^{j_n(d)}(y_2),\ f^{i_n(d)}(y_2)]$ which implies, by Lemma 2.6 and Denjoy's inequality, that the four intervals $[y_1,\ y_2]$, $[y_2,\ y_3]$, $[f^{j_n(d)-i_n(d)}(y_2), y_2]$, $[y_2,\ f^{i_n(d)-j_n(d)}(y_2)]$ are comparable. In particular, the ratios $\dfrac{m([f^{-i_n(d)}(d),\ y_2])}{m([y_1,\ y_2])}$ and $\dfrac{m([f^{-i_n(d)}(d),\ y_2])}{m([f^{j_n(d)-i_n(d)}(y_2),\ y_2])} = t_n(d)$ are comparable. So, for $d \in Q_2(\mathbb{N}_0)$, $\lim_{n\to+\infty}\ t_n(d) = 0$ which is equivalent to the assertion:

$$\forall\ \gamma > 0,\ \exists\ n_\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ such that for every } \ n \geq n_\gamma,\ n \in \mathbb{N}_0\ :\ f^{-i_n(d)}(d) \in V^{(f)}_{n,\gamma}(y_2).$$

• Similarly, the ratios $\dfrac{m([y_2,\ f^{-j_n(d)}(d)])}{m([y_1,\ y_2])}$ and $\dfrac{m([y_2,\ f^{-j_n(d)}(d)])}{m([y_2,\ f^{i_n(d)-j_n(d)}(y_2)])}$ are comparable, which is comparable to the ratio $\dfrac{m([f^{j_n(d)-i_n(d)}(y_2),\ f^{-i_n(d)}(d)])}{m([f^{j_n(d)-i_n(d)}(y_2),\ y_2])} = 1 - t_n(d)$ (by the Lemma 2.6). So, for $d \in Q_3(\mathbb{N}_0)$, $\lim_{n\to+\infty}\ t_n(d) = 1$, which is equivalent to the assertion:

$$\forall\ \gamma > 0,\ \exists\ n_\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ such that for every } \ n \geq n_\gamma,\ n \in \mathbb{N}_0 :\ f^{-j_n(d)}(d) \in V^{(f)}_{n,\gamma}(y_2).$$

Assertion (2): Let $d \in Q_1(\mathbb{N}_0)$. There exists $0 < \gamma(d) < 1$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $t_n(d) \geq \gamma(d)$ and $1 - t_n(d) \geq \gamma(d)$. Since $Q_1(\mathbb{N}_0)$ is finite there exists $0 < \gamma_0 < 1$ and an infinite subset M_2 of $\mathbb{N}_0$ ($\mathbb{N}_0\backslash M_2$ is finite) such that the points $f^{-i_n(d)}(d)$ and $f^{-j_n(d)}(d)$ are contained in the set $S^1\backslash V^{(f)}_{n,\gamma_0}(y_2)$ for all $d \in Q_1(M_2)$ and $n \in M_2$. By Lemma 2.3, $d \notin f^i([y_1,\ y_2]) \cup f^j([y_2,\ y_3])$, for every $0 \leq i < q_n,\ i \neq i_n(d),\ j = \varphi_n(i)$. Hence, for every $0 \leq i < q_n,\ i \neq i_n(d)$: $f^{-i}(d) \notin [y_1,\ y_2]$ and every $0 \leq j < q_n,\ j \neq j_n(d) = \varphi_n(i_n(d))$: $f^{-j}(d) \notin [y_2,\ y_3]$. In particular, for every $0 \leq i < q_n,\ i \neq i_n(d),\ i \neq j_n(d)$: $f^{-i}(d) \notin [y_1,\ y_3]$. So $f^{-i}(d) \notin V^{(f)}_{n,\gamma_0}(y_2)$ since $V^{(f)}_{n,\gamma_0}(y_2) \subset [y_1,\ y_3]$. Then $\bigcup_{0\leq i<q_n} f^{-i}(B\backslash E(c_1, c)) \subset S^1\backslash V^{(f)}_{n,\gamma_0}(y_2)$.

Write $\mathbb{N}_0$ instead of M_2.

Assertion (3): Let $d \in Q_{11}(\mathbb{N}_0)$. Then there exist an integer $n(d) \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ $(n \geq n(d))$, $0 \leq i_n(d) < q_{n-1}$,

$$f^{-i_n(d)}(d) \in [y_1,\ y_2] \cup f^{j_n(d)-i_n(d)}([y_2,\ y_3]) = [y_1,\ y_2] \cup [f^{q_n}(y_1),\ f^{q_n}(y_2)]$$

$$= [f^{q_n}(y_1), y_2]$$

and

$$\gamma_0 \leq t_n(d) = \frac{m([f^{-i_n(d)}(d),\ y_2])}{m([f^{q_n}(y_1),\ y_2])} \leq 1 - \gamma_0.$$

Since the intervals $[f^{q_n}(y_1),\ y_2]$ and $[y_1,\ y_2]$ are comparable, there exists $0 < \gamma_1 < \gamma_0$ and an integer $n'(d) \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for all $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $n \geq n'(d)$: $f^{-i_n(d)}(d) \in [f^{q_n}(y_1) + \gamma_1 l_{n-1},\ y_2 - \gamma_1 l_{n-1}]$. Since $Q_{11}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ is finite, there exists an integer $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for all $d \in Q_{11}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \geq n_1$:

$$f^{-i_n(d)}(d) \in [f^{q_n}(y_1) + \gamma_1 l_{n-1},\ y_2 - \gamma_1 l_{n-1}].$$

Assertion (4): Let $d \in Q_{12}(\mathbb{N}_0)$. Then there exist an integer $n(d) \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \geq n(d)$, $q_{n-1} \leq i_n(d) < q_n$, $f^{-j_n(d)}(d) \in [y_2,\ y_3]$ and

$$\gamma_0 \leq t_n(d) = \frac{m([f^{-i_n(d)}(d),\ y_2])}{m([y_1,\ y_2])} \leq 1 - \gamma_0.$$

Since the ratios

$$\frac{m([f^{-j_n(d)}(d),\ y_3])}{m([y_2,\ y_3])} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{m([f^{-i_n(d)}(d),\ y_2])}{m([y_1,\ y_2])}$$

are comparable, there exists $0 < \gamma_2 < \gamma_0$ such that $f^{-j_n(d)}(d) \in [y_2+\gamma_2 l_{n-1},\ y_3-\gamma_2 l_{n-1}]$, for all $d \in Q_{12}(\mathbb{N}_0)$. Since $Q_{12}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ is finite, there exists an integer $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for all $d \in Q_{12}(\mathbb{N}_0)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \geq n_2$:

$$f^{-j_n(d)}(d) \in [y_2 + \gamma_2 l_{n-1},\ y_3 - \gamma_2 l_{n-1}]$$

□

Corollary 3.6. *For every $d \in E(c_1, c)$, we have*

$$\lim_{n \to +\infty,\ n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \frac{m([f^{-k_n(d)}(d),\ y_2])}{m([y_1,\ y_2])} = 0$$

Proof. It is a consequence of Proposition 3.5. □

4. **Secondary Cells**

We introduce in this section a new triple (z_1, z_2, z_3) in $U_\delta(x_0)$ depending on two real parameters β and γ. Let $\beta,\ \gamma \in]0, \gamma_0[$ $(\beta < \gamma)$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ $(n \geq n_\beta)$, we define the points $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in S^1$ $(z_1 \prec z_2 \prec z_3)$ as follows: $z_2 = y_2$ and $z_1,\ z_3 \in V^{(f)}_{n,\gamma}(z_2) \backslash V^{(f)}_{n,\beta}(z_2)$ i.e.

$$\beta \leq \frac{m([z_1, z_2])}{m([y_1, y_2])} \leq \gamma \text{ and } \ \beta \leq \frac{m([z_2, z_3])}{m([y_1, y_2])} \leq \gamma$$

Definition (secondary cell). The triple $(z_1,\ z_2,\ z_3)$ is called a (β, γ)-derived cell associated to $(f, x_0, c, \mathbb{N}_0, \delta)$.

Proposition 4.1. *Under the notations above, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \geq n_\beta$ we have:*

(0) $[z_1, z_3] \subset V^{(f)}_{n,\gamma}(y_2) \subset [y_1, y_3]$.
(1) *For any $d \in E(c_1, c)$, there exists a unique $0 \leq k_n(d) < q_n$ such that $f^{-k_n(d)}(d) \in V^{(f)}_{n,\frac{1}{4}\beta}(y_2)$.*
(2) $m\left(f^j([z_1, z_3])\right) \leq K\lambda^n$, *for every $0 \leq j < q_n$, where $\lambda = (1+e^{-V})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and K is a constant independent of n, $V = Var(\log(\mathrm{Df}))$.*
(3) $\sum_{j=0}^{q_n-1} m\left(f^j([z_1, z_3])\right) \leq 2$.
(4) *The triples $\left(z_1, z_2, z_3\right)$ and $(f^{q_n}(z_1), f^{q_n}(z_2), f^{q_n}(z_3))$ satisfy conditions (a) and (b) of Definition 2.8 for x_0 and the constant $R(\beta) = \frac{Re^{2V}}{\beta}$, where $R = e^{3V} + e^V + 1$.*
(5) *$f^i([z_1, z_3])$ does not contain any point of B, for every $0 \leq i < q_n$ and $i \neq k_n(d)$, $d \in E(c_1, c)$.*
(6) *For every $d \in E(c_1, c),\ d \in f^{k_n(d)}(]z_1, z_3[)$.*

Proof. Assertion (0): This results from the definition of $\big(z_1, z_2, z_3\big)$, for γ small.

Assertion (1): This follows from the Assertion (1) in Proposition 3.5.

Assertions (2) and (3) hold since $[z_1, z_3] \subset [y_1, y_3]$ and by applying the same proof to $\big(y_1, y_2, y_3\big)$ instead of $\big(y_1, y_2, y_3\big)$ of the properties (c-2) and (c-3) of Proposition 3.1.
Assertion (4): We have

$$\frac{\beta}{\gamma} = \frac{\beta m([y_1, y_2])}{\gamma m([y_1, y_2])} \leq \frac{m([z_2, z_3])}{m([z_1, z_2])} \leq \frac{\gamma m([y_1, y_2])}{\beta m([y_1, y_2])} = \frac{\gamma}{\beta}.$$

Then by Lemma 2.6, we get

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-2V}\frac{\beta}{\gamma} &= e^{-2V}\frac{\beta m([y_1, y_2])}{\gamma m([y_1, y_2])} \\ &\leq e^{-2V}\frac{m([z_2, z_3])}{m([z_1, z_2])} \leq \frac{m(f^{q_n}([z_2, z_3]))}{m(f^{q_n}([z_1, z_2]))} \\ &\leq e^{2V}\frac{m([z_2, z_3])}{m([z_1, z_2])} \\ &\leq e^{2V}\frac{\gamma m([y_1, y_2])}{\beta m([y_1, y_2])} = e^{2V}\frac{\gamma}{\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\big(z_1, z_2, z_3\big)$ satisfies conditions (a) and (b) of Definition 2.8 for the constant $R(\beta, \gamma) = \frac{R}{\beta}e^{2V}$. On the other hand, since $[z_1, z_3] \subset [f^{q_n}(y_1), y_3]$, $x_0 \in [f^{q_n}(y_1), y_3]$ and $\max\left(m([f^{q_n}(y_1), x_0]); m([x_0, y_3])\right) \leq Rm([y_1, y_2])$, it follows that

$$\max_{1\leq i\leq 3}\big(m([x_0, z_i]) \leq \max\left(m([f^{q_n}(y_1), x_0]); m([x_0, y_3])\right) \leq Rm([y_1, y_2]) \leq \frac{R}{\beta}m([z_1, z_2]).$$

Furthermore, as $[z_1, z_3] \subset]y_1, y_3[$ then $f^{q_n}([z_1, z_3]) \subset f^{q_n}(]y_1, y_3[)$

Since $x_0 \in [f^{q_n}(y_1), y_3]$ and $f^{q_n}(]y_1, y_3[) \cup f^{q_{n-1}}(]f^{q_n}(y_1), y_2[) \cup f^{q_n - q_{n-1}}(]y_2, y_3[) \subset [f^{q_n}(y_1), y_3]$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1\leq i\leq 3} m([f^{q_n}(z_i), x_0]) &\leq \max\left(m([f^{q_n}(y_1), x_0]); m([x_0, y_3])\right) \\ &\leq \frac{R}{\beta}m([z_1, z_2]) \\ &\leq \frac{R}{\beta}e^{2V}m(f^{q_n}([z_1, z_2]) \text{ (by Denjoy's inequality).} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore
$\big(f^{q_n}(z_1), f^{q_n}(z_2), f^{q_n}(z_3)\big)$ satisfies conditions (a) and (b) of Definition 2.8 for the constant $R(\beta, \gamma) = \frac{R}{\beta}e^{2V}$.

Assertion (5): If $d \in B$ and $0 \leq i < q_n$ be an integer such that $d \in f^i([z_1, z_3])$ then $f^{-i}(d) \in [z_1, z_3] \subset V^{(f)}_{n,\gamma}(y_2) \subset V^{(f)}_{n,\gamma_0}(y_2)$. According to the Assertion (2) of Propositions 3.5,

we obtain $f^{-i}(d) \notin \bigcup_{j=0}^{q_n-1} f^{-j}\big(B\backslash E(c_1,c)\big)$, $0 \le i < q_n$. In particular, $f^{-i}(d) \notin f^{-i}\big(B\backslash E(c_1,c)\big)$. Hence $d \in E(c_1,c)$ such that $0 \le i < q_n$ and $f^{-i}(d) \in V^{(f)}_{n,\gamma}(y_2)$. By Assertion (1), $i = k_n(d)$.

Assertion (6) is a consequence of Assertions (0) and (1). □

Proposition 4.2 ([4], Proposition 4.2)**.** *Let $(y_1,y_2,y_3) \subset U_\delta(x_0)$ be the primary cell and (z_1,z_2,z_3) an (β,γ) secondary cell associated to $(f,x_0,c,\mathbb{N}_0)$. Let h be the homeomorphism conjugating f to g and assume that it admits in x_0 a positive derivative $Dh(x_0) > 0$. Then the following properties hold:*

(1) *$(h(y_1),h(y_2),h(y_3))$ is a primary cell associated to $(g,h(x_0),h(c),\mathbb{N}_0)$.*
(2) *$(h(z_1),h(z_2),h(z_3))$ is a $(\frac{\beta}{2},2\gamma)$-derived cell associated to $(g,h(x_0),h(c),\mathbb{N}_0)$.*
(3) *There is an integer $n_\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \ge n_\gamma$:*

$$h\big(V^{(f)}_{n,\gamma}(y_2)\big) \subset V^{(g)}_{n,2\gamma}\big(h(y_2)\big) \subset h\big(V^{(f)}_{n,4\gamma}(y_2)\big)$$

Proposition 4.3. *Under the notations of Proposition 4.2, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \ge n_\beta$ we have:*

(h-0) $[h(z_1),h(z_3)] \subset V^{(g)}_{n,2\gamma}(h(y_2)) \subset [h(y_1),h(y_3)]$.
(h-1) *For any $d \in E(c_1,c)$, $k_n(d)$ is the unique integer in $[0,\ q_n[$ such that $g^{-k_n(d)}(h(d)) \in V^{(g)}_{n,\frac{1}{2}\beta}(h(y_2))$.*
(h-2) *$m\big(g^j([h(z_1),h(z_3)])\big) \le K'(\lambda')^n$, for every $0 \le j < q_n$, where $\lambda' = (1+e^{-V'})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and K' is a constant independent of n, $V' = Var(\log(Dg))$.*
(h-3) $\sum_{j=0}^{q_n-1} m\big(g^j([h(z_1),h(z_3)])\big) \le 2$
(h-4) *$g^i([h(z_1),h(z_3)])$ does not contain any break point of $h(B)$ for every $0 \le i < q_n$ and $i \ne k_n(d),\ d \in E(c_1,c)$.*
(h-5) *For every $d \in E(c_1,c)$,*

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{m\big([g^{-k_n(d)}(h(d)),h(y_2)]\big)}{m\big([h(y_1),h(y_2)]\big)} = 0$$

(h-6) *For every $d \in E(c_1,c),\ h(d) \in g^{k_n(d)}(]h(z_1),h(z_3)[)$.*

Proof. Assertion (h-0) is a consequence of Proposition 4.2, (3).

(h-1): Let $d \in E(c_1,c)$, by Proposition 4.1 (1), there exists $0 \le k_n(d) < q_n$ such that $f^{-k_n(d)}(d) \in V^{(f)}_{n,\frac{1}{4}\beta}(z_2)$; then $g^{-k_n(d)}(h(d)) = h(f^{-k_n(d)}(d)) \in h(V^{(f)}_{n,\frac{1}{4}\beta}(z_2)) \subset V^{(g)}_{n,\frac{1}{2}\beta}(h(z_2))$ for every $n \ge n''_\beta,\ n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Uniqueness: If $0 \le i,j < q_n$ satisfy $g^{-i}(h(d)),\ g^{-j}(h(d)) \in V^{(g)}_{n,2\gamma}(h(z_2))$, then $f^{-i}(d),\ f^{-j}(d) \in h^{-1}\big(V^{(g)}_{n,\gamma}(h(z_2))\big) \subset V^{(f)}_{n,2\gamma}(z_2)$. Therefore by Proposition 4.1 (1), $i = j$.

(h-2) and (h-3): by Proposition 4.2, (2), $(h(z_1),h(z_2),h(z_3))$ is a $(\frac{\beta}{2},2\gamma)$-derived cell associated to $(g,h(x_0),h(c),\mathbb{N}_0)$. Therefore, the proof is similar to Proposition 4.1, *(2)* and *(3)* by replacing f by g.

(h-4): Let $0 \le i < q_n$ and assume that $g^i\big([h(z_1),h(z_3)]\big)$ contains a break point $d' = h(d)$ of g for a break point d of f, then $f^i\big([z_1,z_3]\big)$ contains the break point d of f. By Proposition 4.1,

(1) and (5), we have $d \in E(c_1, c)$ and $i = k_n(d)$.
(h-5): Let $d \in E(c_1, c)$ and $\gamma > 0$. By Proposition 3.1 (6), there is an integer $n'_\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \geq n'_\gamma : f^{-k_n(d)}(d) \in V^{(f)}(y_2)$. On the other hand, by Proposition 4.2, (3), there is an integer $n_\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n_\gamma \geq n'_\gamma$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \geq n_\gamma : h\big(V^{(f)}_{n,\frac{\gamma}{2}}(y_2)\big) \subset V^{(g)}_{n,\gamma}(h(y_2))$. As $g^{-k_n(d)}(h(d)) = h(f^{-k_n(d)}(d))$, it follows that $g^{-k_n(d)}(h(d)) \in V^{(g)}_{n,\gamma}(h(y_2))$ for every $n \geq n_\gamma,\ n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since $\gamma > 0$ is arbitrary, so,

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{m\big([g^{-k_n(d)}(h(d)), h(y_2)]\big)}{m\big([h(y_1), h(y_2)]\big)} = 0$$

(h-6) is a consequence of Assertions $(h-0)$ and $(h-1)$. □

5. **Control of distortions**

Proposition 5.1 ([4], Proposition 5.1)**.** *Let $\mathbb{N}_0$ and γ_0 are as in Proposition 3.5. Let $\beta,\ \gamma \in]0, \gamma_0[\ (\beta < \gamma)$. Assume that the conjugation homeomorphism h from f to g admits at x_0 a positive derivative $\mathrm{Dh}(x_0) = \omega_0 > 0$. Then there exists an integer $n_\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that: for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \geq n_\beta$, we have*

$$\left| \frac{\mathrm{Dr}_{g^{q_n}}\big(h(z_1), h(z_2), h(z_3)\big)}{\mathrm{Dr}_{f^{q_n}}(z_1, z_2, z_3)} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{2}{1-\gamma_0}\beta$$

The next proposition is an another distortion control which is opposite to the one of Proposition 5.1, this allows us to prove that the conjugation from f to g is singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

Proposition 5.2. *Assume that the irrational rotation number of f is of bounded type. Let c, c_1 in $B(f)$, $c \neq c_1$, $\mathbb{N}_0$ and γ_0 are as in Proposition 3.5. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $0 < \gamma < \gamma_0$ such that for any $\beta \in]0, \gamma[$ there exists $n_\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for all $n \geq n_\beta,\ n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ the (β, γ) secondary cell (z_1, z_2, z_3) associated to $(f, x_0, c, \mathbb{N}_0, \delta)$ satisfies the following inequality*

$$\left| \frac{Dr_{g^{q_n}}\,(h(z_1), h(z_2), h(z_3))}{Dr_{f^{q_n}}(z_1, z_2, z_3)} - \Pi(c_1, c) \right| \leq A\ \varepsilon,\ \text{for some constant } A > 0,$$

where

$$\Pi(c_1, c) = \prod_{d \in E(c_1, c)} \frac{\sigma_g(h(d))}{\sigma_f(d)}.$$

The proof of the proposition 5.2 is an elaboration of the proof of ([4], Proposition 5.3) and so we only describe the changes that are necessary.

Lemma 5.3. *Assume that the rotation number α of f is of bounded type. Let $c_1 \in C(f)\backslash\{c\}$, u_0, γ_{c,c_1} and $\mathbb{N}_0$ as in Proposition 3.5. Let h be the conjugating from f to R_α: $h \circ f = R_\alpha \circ h$. Assume that $Dh(x_0) > 0$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that for any $u \in]0, \eta[$ there exists $n_{u,r} \in \mathbb{N}_{c,c_1}$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_{c,c_1},\ n \geq n_{u,r}$: the (r,u)-derived cell (z_1, z_2, z_3) associated to (f, x_0, c) satisfies*

$$|Dcr_{f^{q_n}}(z_1, z_2, z_3) - \Pi_f(c, c_1)| \leq C_1\varepsilon,$$

where

$$\Pi_f(c,c_1)=\prod_{b\in E(c_1,c)}\sigma_f(b)$$

and C_1 *is a positive constant.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon>0$. Since Df is absolutely continuous on every interval $[c_i,c_{i+1}]$ $(0\le i\le p)$, there exists a real $0<\eta_0<e^{2V}\gamma_0$ such that for every disjoint intervals $([a_j,b_j])_{j\in J}$ of continuity intervals of Df (these later are the $[c_i,c_{i+1}]$ $(0\le i\le p)$) such that if $\sum_{j\in J}|a_j-b_j|<\eta_0$ then $\sum_{j\in J}|\mathrm{Df}(a_j)-\mathrm{Df}(b_j)|<\varepsilon$. Let $0<\beta<\gamma<\frac{1}{5}e^{-2V}\eta_0$ and (z_1,z_2,z_3) be the (β,γ)-derived cell associated to $(f,x_0,c,\mathbb{N}_0)$. For $n\in\mathbb{N}_0$, denote the following:

- $I:=\{0,1,\dots,q_n-1\}\backslash\{k_n(d):\ d\in E(c_1,c)\}$.
- $D_i(f):=\mathrm{Dcr}_f\big(f^i(z_1),f^i(z_2),f^i(z_3)\big),\ 0\le i<q_n$.
- $P:=\prod_{i\in I}D_i(f)\ ;\ P_1:=\prod_{d\in E(c_1,c)}D_{k_n(d)}(f)$.
- $D_n(f):=\mathrm{Dcr}_{f^{q_n}}(z_1,z_2,z_3)$.

One has $D_n(f)=PP_1$.

Step 1. We consider $D_i(f)$, $i\in I$. By Proposition 4.1 (5), Df is continuous on the interval $[f^i(z_1),f^i(z_3)]$. Then by the mean value theorem, there exist $a_i\in]f^i(z_1),f^i(z_2)[$ and $b_i\in]f^i(z_2),f^i(z_3)[$ such that $D_i(f)=\dfrac{\mathrm{Df}(a_i)}{\mathrm{Df}(b_i)}$. Since $\big([a_i,f^i(z_2)]\big)_{i\in I}$ are disjoint intervals of continuity of Df, by Lemma 2.6, they satisfy the inequalities :

$$\begin{aligned}\textstyle\sum_{i\in I}m([a_i,f^i(z_2)]) &\le \textstyle\sum_{i\in I}m([f^i(z_1),f^i(z_2)])\\ &\le \textstyle\sum_{i\in I}e^{2V}\dfrac{m([z_1,z_2])}{m([y_1,y_2])}m([f^i(y_1),f^i(y_2)])\\ &\le e^{2V}\gamma\textstyle\sum_{i\in I}m([f^i(y_1),f^i(y_2)])\\ &\le e^{2V}\gamma\\ &\le \eta_0.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\sum_{i\in I}|\mathrm{Df}(f^i(z_2))-\mathrm{Df}(a_i)|\le\varepsilon \tag{5.1}$$

Also, $\big([f^i(z_2),b_i]\big)_{i\in I}$ are disjoint intervals of continuity of Df, so by Lemma 2.6, they satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i\in I} m([f^i(z_2), b_i]) &\leq \sum_{i\in I} m([f^i(z_2), f^i(z_3)])\\ &\leq \sum_{i\in I} e^{2V}\frac{m([z_2,z_3])}{m([y_1,y_2])} m([f^i(y_1), f^i(y_2)])\\ &\leq e^{2V}\gamma \sum_{i\in I} m([f^i(y_1), f^i(y_2)]) \leq \eta_0.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\sum_{i\in I} |\mathrm{Df}(f^i(z_2)) - \mathrm{Df}(b_i)| \leq \varepsilon \tag{5.2}$$

Combining (5.1) and (5.2), we get

$$\sum_{i\in I} |\mathrm{Df}(b_i) - \mathrm{Df}(a_i)| \leq 2\varepsilon. \tag{5.3}$$

Set $D_i^*(f) := \max\big(D_i(f), (D_i(f))^{-1}\big)$ and $P^* := \prod_{i\in I} D_i^*(f)$.

Since Df takes its values in $[m_1, M_1]$ $(m_1 > 0)$, the following properties hold:

$0 \leq D_i^*(f) - 1 \leq \dfrac{1}{m_1}|\mathrm{Df}(b_i) - \mathrm{Df}(a_i)|.$

$\sum_{i\in I} |D_i^*(f) - 1| \leq \dfrac{2}{m_1}\varepsilon.$

$|\log D_i(f)| = \log D_i^*(f) \leq D_i^*(f) - 1$

$\dfrac{1}{P^*} \leq P \leq P^*.$

It follows that

$$e^{-C_0\varepsilon} \leq P \leq e^{C_0\varepsilon} \ \text{ where } C_0 = \frac{2}{m_1}. \tag{5.4}$$

Step 2. We consider $D_{k_n(d)}(f),\ d \in E(c_1, c)$. We have $d \in\ ]f^{k_n(d)}(z_1), f^{k_n(d)}(z_3)[$.

Case 2a. $d \in]f^{k_n(d)}(z_1), f^{k_n(d)}(z_2)[$ with $k_n(d) = i_n(d)$. By Proposition 4.1 (5), Df is continuous on the intervals $[f^{k_n(d)}(z_1), d]$, $[d, f^{k_n(d)}(z_2)]$ and $[f^{k_n(d)}(z_2), f^{k_n(d)}(z_3)]$; by the mean value theorem there exist $t_1 \in]f^{k_n(d)}(z_1), d[$, $t_2 \in]d, f^{k_n(d)}(z_2)[$ and $t_3 \in]f^{k_n(d)}(z_2), f^{k_n(d)}(z_3)[$ such that

$$D_{k_n(d)}(f) = (1 - r_n(d))\frac{\mathrm{Df}(t_1)}{\mathrm{Df}(t_3)} + r_n(d)\frac{\mathrm{Df}(t_2)}{\mathrm{Df}(t_3)}$$

where

$$r_n(d) = \frac{m([d, f^{k_n(d)}(z_2)])}{m([f^{k_n(d)}(z_1), f^{k_n(d)}(z_2)])}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}|D_{k_n(d)}(f) - \sigma_f(d)| &\leq |\frac{\mathrm{Df}(t_1)}{\mathrm{Df}(t_3)} - \frac{D_-f(d)}{D_+f(d)}| + r_n(d)\frac{|\mathrm{Df}(t_1) - \mathrm{Df}(t_2)|}{\mathrm{Df}(t_3)}\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$|\frac{\mathrm{Df}(t_1)}{\mathrm{Df}(t_3)} - \frac{D_-f(d)}{D_+f(d)}| \leq \frac{M_1}{m_1^2}\big(|\mathrm{Df}(t_1) - D_-f(d)| + |\mathrm{Df}(t_3) - D_+f(d)|\big),$$

and by Lemma 2.6

$$\begin{aligned} r_n(d) &= \frac{m\big(f^{k_n(d)}([f^{-k_n(d)}(d), z_2])\big)}{m\big(f^{k_n(d)}([z_1, z_2]\big)} \\ &\leq e^{2V}\frac{m([f^{-k_n(d)}(d), z_2])}{m([z_1, z_2])} \\ &\leq e^{2V}\frac{m([y_1, y_2])}{m([z_1, z_2])} \times \frac{m([f^{-k_n(d)}(d), z_2])}{m([y_1, y_2])} \\ &\leq \frac{e^{2V}}{\beta}s_n(d) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$s_n(d) := \frac{m([f^{-k_n(d)}(d), z_2])}{l([y_1, y_2])}.$$

It follows that:

$$|D_{k_n(d)}(f) - \sigma_f(d)| \leq K_0\big(\frac{s_n(d)}{\beta} + |\mathrm{Df}(t_1) - D_-f(d)| + |\mathrm{Df}(t_3) - D_+f(d)|\big)$$

where

$K_0 = \max(\frac{M_1}{m_1}e^{2V}, \frac{M_1}{m_1^2})$.

Since $\lim_{n\to+\infty} s_n(d) = 0$ (Corollary 3.6), there exists $n_{d,\beta} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \geq n_{d,\beta}$, one has $s_n(d) < \beta\varepsilon$. The intervals $(]t_1, d[;\ ]d, t_3[)_{d\in E(c_1,c)}$ are disjoint intervals of continuity of Df, they satisfy by Lemma 2.6:

$$\begin{aligned} m([t_1, d]) + m([d, t_3]) &\leq 2m([f^{k_n(d)}(z_1), f^{k_n(d)}(z_2)]) + m([f^{k_n(d)}(z_2), f^{k_n(d)}(z_3)]) \\ &\leq 3e^{2V}\gamma m([f^{k_n(d)}(y_1), f^{k_n(d)}(y_2)]) \\ &\leq 3e^{2V}\gamma < \eta_0 \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$|\mathrm{Df}(t_1) - D_-f(d)| + |\mathrm{Df}(t_3) - D_+f(d)| < \varepsilon$$

Hence, there exists $n_{d,\beta} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $n \geq n_{d,\beta}$,

$$|D_{k_n(d)}(f) - \sigma_f(d)| \leq 2K_0\varepsilon \tag{5.5}$$

Case 2b. $d \in]f^{k_n(d)}(z_2), f^{k_n(d)}(z_3)[$ with $k_n(d) = j_n(d)$. By Proposition 4.1 (b-5), Df is continuous on the intervals $[f^{k_n(d)}(z_1), f^{k_n(d)}(z_2)]$, $[f^{k_n(d)}(z_2), d]$ and $[d, f^{k_n(d)}(z_3)]$. By the mean value theorem, there exist $s_1 \in]d, f^{k_n(d)}(z_3)[$, $s_2 \in]f^{k_n(d)}(z_2), d[$ and $s_3 \in]f^{k_n(d)}(z_1), f^{k_n(d)}(z_2)[$ such that

$$D^{-1}_{k_n(d)}(f) = (1 - r_n'(d))\frac{\mathrm{Df}(s_1)}{\mathrm{Df}(s_3)} + r_n'(d)\frac{\mathrm{Df}(s_2)}{\mathrm{Df}(s_3)}$$

where

$$r'_n(d) = \frac{m[f^{k_n(d)}(z_2), d])}{m[f^{k_n(d)}(z_2), f^{k_n(d)}(z_3)])}.$$

As in Case 2a, we have

$$|D_{k_n(d)}(f)^{-1} - \sigma_f(d)^{-1}| \leq |\frac{\mathrm{Df}(s_1)}{\mathrm{Df}(s_3)} - \frac{D_+f(d)}{D_-f(d)}| + r'_n(d)\frac{|\mathrm{Df}(s_1) - \mathrm{Df}(s_2)|}{\mathrm{Df}(s_3)}$$

Since $|\frac{\mathrm{Df}(s_1)}{\mathrm{Df}(s_3)} - \frac{D_+f(d)}{D_-f(d)}| \leq \frac{M_1}{m_1^2}\big(|\mathrm{Df}(s_1) - D_+f(d)| + |\mathrm{Df}(s_3) - D_-f(d)|\big)$,

and by Lemma 2.6

$$\begin{aligned} r'_n(d) &= \frac{m\big(f^{k_n(d)}([z_2, f^{-k_n(d)}(d)])\big)}{m\big(f^{k_n(d)}([z_2, z_3]\big)} \\ &\leq e^{2V}\frac{m([z_2, f^{-k_n(d)}(d)])}{m([z_2, z_3])} \\ &\leq e^{2V}\frac{m([y_1, y_2])}{m([z_2, z_3])} \times \frac{m([z_2, f^{-k_n(d)}(d)])}{m([y_1, y_2])} \\ &\leq \frac{e^{2V}}{\beta}s'_n(d), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$s'_n(d) := \frac{m([z_2, f^{-k_n(d)}(d)])}{m([y_1, y_2])}.$$

It follows that

$$|D_{k_n(d)}(f)^{-1} - \sigma_f(d)^{-1}| \leq K_0\big(\frac{s'_n(d)}{\beta} + |\mathrm{Df}(s_1) - D_+f(d)| + |\mathrm{Df}(s_3) - D_-f(d)|\big)$$

where

$$K_0 = \max(\frac{M_1}{m_1}e^{2V}, \frac{M_1}{m_1^2}).$$

By Corollary 3.6 : $\lim\limits_{n\to+\infty} s'_n(d) = 0$. Hence, there exists $n_{d,\beta} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \geq n_{d,\beta},\ s'_n(d) < \beta\varepsilon$. The intervals $(]d, s_1[;\ ]s_3, d[)_{d\in E(c_1,c)}$ are disjoint intervals of continuity of Df, they satisfy, by Lemma 2.6,

$$\begin{aligned} m([d, s_1]) + m([s_3, d]) &\leq m([f^{k_n(d)}(z_1), f^{k_n(d)}(z_2)]) + 2m([f^{k_n(d)}(z_2), f^{k_n(d)}(z_3)]) \\ &\leq 3e^{2V}\gamma m([f^{k_n(d)}(y_1), f^{k_n(d)}(y_2)]) \\ &\leq 3e^{2V}\gamma < \eta_0 \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$|\mathrm{Df}(s_1) - D_+f(d)| + |\mathrm{Df}(s_3) - D_-f(d)| < \varepsilon$$

Hence, there exists $n_{d,\beta} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0, n \geq n_{d,\beta}$,

$$|D_{k_n(d)}(f)^{-1} - \sigma_f(d)^{-1}| \leq 2K_0\varepsilon \tag{5.6}$$

Therefore from the cases 2a and 2b, we conclude that there exists $n_{d,\beta} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \geq n_{d,\beta}$,

$$|D_{k_n(d)}(f) - \sigma_f(d)| \leq K_0\varepsilon \tag{5.7}$$

Since $E(c_1, c)$ is finite, there exists $n_\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \geq n_\beta$,

$$|\prod_{d\in E(c_1,c)} D_{k_n(d)}(f) - \prod_{d\in E(c_1,c)} \sigma_f(d)| \leq \varepsilon \tag{5.8}$$

Hence, (5.4) and (5.8) imply that: there exist $n_\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \geq n_\beta$,

$$|Dcr_{f^{q_n}}(z_1, z_2, z_3) - \nu(c)| \leq C_1\varepsilon \tag{5.9}$$

where $\nu(c) = \prod_{d\in E(c_1,c)}\ \sigma_f(d)$ and C_1 is a positive constant. □

Lemma 5.4. *Under the hypothesis of Proposition 5.2, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $0 < \gamma < \gamma_0$, such that for any $\beta \in]0, \gamma[$, there exist $n_\beta \in \mathbb{M}_0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{M}_0,\ n \geq n_\beta$, the (β, γ)-secondary cell (z_1, z_2, z_3) associated to $(f, x_0, b, \mathbb{M}_0, \delta)$ satisfies*

$$|Dr_{g^{q_n(b)}}(h(z_1), h(z_2), h(z_3)) - \Pi_g(h(c), h(c_1))| \leq C_2\varepsilon$$

where $\Pi_g(h(c), h(c_1)) = \prod_{d\in E(c_1,c)} \sigma_g(h(d))$ *and* C_2 *is a positive constant.*

Proof. The proof is a consequence of Lemma 5.3 and (Proposition 4.3, (h-5)) applied to the $(\frac{\beta}{2}, \gamma)$-derived cell $(h(z_1), h(z_2), h(z_3))$ associated to $(g, h(x_0), h(c), \mathbb{N}_0)$ instead of the (β, γ)-derived cell (z_1, z_2, z_3) associated to $(f, x_0, c, \mathbb{N}_0)$. □

Proof of Proposition 5.2. The proof results from the Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4. □

6. **Proof of Main Theorem**

Let $f,\ g \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ with the same irrational rotation number α of bounded type. Suppose that f and g satisfy the (KO) condition. By Corollary 2.11, there exist two piecewise quadratic homeomorphisms $K, L \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ such that $F = L \circ f \circ L^{-1}$ and $G = K \circ g \circ K^{-1}$ have the following properties:

(1) $F, G \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ and have the same irrational rotation number α,
(2) The break points of F (resp. G) are on *pairwise distinct* F-orbits (resp. G-orbits),
(3) F and G satisfy the (KO) condition,
(4) Let h the conjugating map between f and g i.e. $h \circ f = g \circ h$ and set $v = K \circ h \circ L^{-1}$. Then
    - v is an absolutely continuous (resp. a singular) function if and only if so is h.
    - $v \circ F = G \circ v$.

Therefore, we may assume that all break points of f (resp. g) are on *pairwise distinct* f-orbits (resp. g-orbits). Now by Proposition 2.13, there exists a homeomorphism u of S^1 such that $G = u \circ f \circ u^{-1} \in \mathcal{P}(S^1)$ with the following properties:

- $C(f) \subset B := \{c_i :\ i = 0, 1, \dots, q\}$, $(q \geq p)$.
- $C(G) \subset u(B) := \{u(c_i) :\ i = 0, 1, \dots, q\}$.
- $\sigma_G(u(c_i)) = \sigma_g(d_i)\ ,\ i = 0, 1, \dots, q$.
- $\pi_s(G) = \pi_s(g)$.
- h is singular if and only if so is u.

So we may assume that $u = h$ and $G = g$.
To show that the conjugation homeomorphism h from f to g is singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure m, it suffices to prove that its derivative Dh is zero on a set of Lebesgue total measure. Assume on the contrary that h admits at a point x_0 a positive derivative $Dh(x_0) > 0$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0,\ c \in B$. For $0 < \beta < \gamma < \gamma_0$, write:

$$D_n(\beta, \gamma) := \frac{\mathrm{Dr}_{g^{q_n}}\big(h(z_1), h(z_2), h(z_3)\big)}{\mathrm{Dr}_{f^{q_n}}\big(z_1, z_2, z_3\big)}$$

By Proposition 5.1, there exists $n_\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \geq n_\beta$:

$$|D_n(\beta, \gamma) - 1| \leq \frac{2}{1 - \gamma_0}\beta \tag{6.1}$$

By Proposition 5.2, there exists $\gamma_\varepsilon < \gamma_0$ such that for every $0 < \beta < \gamma_\varepsilon$ there exists $n_\beta(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \geq n_\beta(\varepsilon)$, the (β, γ) secondary cell (z_1, z_2, z_3) $(\gamma < \gamma_\varepsilon)$- associated to $(f, x_0, c, \mathbb{N}_0, \delta)$ satisfies:

$$|D_n(\beta, \gamma) - \Pi(c_1, c)| \leq A\varepsilon, \tag{6.2}$$

where

$$\Pi(c_1, c) := \prod_{d \in E(c_1, c)} \frac{\sigma_g(h(d))}{\sigma_f(d)}$$

and A is a positive constant.

Let $\beta < \gamma < \gamma_\varepsilon$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ n \geq n_\beta(\varepsilon)$. Then (6.1) and (6.2) imply that

$$|\Pi(c_1, c) - 1| \ \leq |D_n(\beta, \gamma) - 1| + |D_n(\beta, \gamma) - \Pi(c_1, c)| \ \leq \frac{2\beta}{1 - \gamma_0} + A\varepsilon$$

Since ε and β are arbitrary, it follows that $\Pi(c_1, c) = 1$. i.e.

$$\prod_{d \in E(c_1, c)} \frac{\sigma_g(h(d))}{\sigma_f(d)} = 1 \tag{6.3}$$

Since $c_1, c \in B$, $c_1 \neq c$ are arbitrary, so for every $(i, k) \in \{0, 1, \ldots,\ q\}^2$ $(i \neq k)$, one has

$$\prod_{d \in E(c_k, c_i)} \frac{\sigma_g(h(d))}{\sigma_f(d)} = 1$$

As by Proposition 3.2, $c_k \notin E(c_k, c_i)$, so we have

$$\prod_{0 \leq j \leq q} \left(\frac{\sigma_g(h(c_j))}{\sigma_f(c_j)}\right)^{e(i,k,j)} = 1,$$

where $e(i, k, j) \in \{0, 1\}$ with

$$\varepsilon(i, k, i) = 1 \text{and } \varepsilon(i, k, k) = 0.$$

It follows that for every $(i, k) \in \{0, 1, \ldots,\ q\}^2,\ i \neq k$, we have

$$\sum_{0 \leq j \leq q} e(i, k, j)\ \log\left(\frac{\sigma_g(h(c_j))}{\sigma_f(c_j)}\right) = 0.$$

For $(i, j, k) \in \{0, \ldots, q\}^3$, set

$$\varepsilon_{k+i(q+1),j} = \begin{cases} e(i,k,j) & \text{if } i \neq k,\ j \neq i \text{ and } j \neq k, \\ 1 & \text{if } i \neq k \text{ and } j = i, \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq k \text{ and } j = k, \\ 0 & \text{if } i = k \end{cases}$$

It follows that for every $(i, k) \in \{0, \ldots, q\}^2$,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{q} \varepsilon_{k+i(q+1),j} \log\left(\frac{\sigma_g(h(c_j))}{\sigma_f(c_j)}\right) = 0$$

Set $A_{q+1} = (a_{l,j})_{0 \leq l < (q+1)^2,\ 0 \leq j < q} \in \mathcal{M}_{(q+1)^2,\ q+1}(\{0, 1\})$ the matrix defined by $a_{l,j} = \varepsilon_{k+i(q+1),j}$, where $l = k + i(q + 1)$ with $0 \leq i,\ k \leq q$. The matrix A_{q+1} has a rank $q + 1$ (see [2], Lemma 6.1). Therefore for every $j \in \{0, 1, \ldots,\ q\}$, $\sigma_g(h(c_j)) = \sigma_f(c_j)$. Hence f and g are break-equivalent, a contradiction. The proof is complete. □

Proof of Corollary 1.4. This follows from the fact that if f and g do not have the same number of singular orbits then f and g are not break-equivalent. □

Proof of Corollary 1.5. Suppose that f and g are break-equivalent. After reduction, one can suppose that $\mathrm{SO}(f) = C(f)$ and $\mathrm{SO}(g) = C(g)$. Then for every $d \in C(g)$, there is $e \in C(f)$ such

that $d = h(e)$ and $\sigma_g(d) = \sigma_f(e)$ i.e. $\sigma_g(d) \in \{\sigma_f(c) : \ c \in C(f)\}$, this contradicts the hypothesis of the corollary. □

Proof of Corollary 1.6. This follows from the fact that the condition (ii) satisfies the assumption of Corollary 1.5. □

Proof of Corollary 1.7. Proof of (i). Since g does not have the $(D)-$ property and f has the $(D)-$ property, so there exists a point $d \in C(g)$ such that $\pi_{s,O_g(d)}(d) \neq 1$ and $\pi_{s,O_f(c)}(f) = 1$ for every $c \in C(f)$. We conclude by Corollary 1.5.

Proof of (ii). By Corollary 2.11, f is conjugate to a class P-homeomorphism $F = K \circ f \circ K^{-1}$ through a piecewise quadratic class P homeomorphism K of S^1. Since f satisfies the $D-$ property, $\pi_{s,O_f(c)}(f) = 1 = \sigma_F(K(c))$ for every $c \in C(f)$. Thus, F is a C^1- diffeomorphism. Moreover, DF is absolutely continuous on S^1 and $D^2F \in L^p(S^1)$ for some $p > 1$. By Katznelson-Ornstein's theorem, μ_F is equivalent to the Lebesgue measure m and so is μ_f. Hence there exists an absolutely continuous map φ such that $\varphi \circ f = R_{\rho(f)} \circ \varphi$. Similarly, there exists an absolutely continuous map ψ such that $\psi \circ g = R_{\rho(f)} \circ \psi$. In addition, ψ^{-1} is absolutely continuous. It follows that $(\psi \circ h \circ \varphi^{-1}) \circ R_{\rho(f)} = R_{\rho(f)} \circ (\psi \circ h \circ \varphi^{-1})$. As $\rho(f)$ is irational then $\psi \circ h \circ \varphi^{-1} = R_\beta$ a rotation, for some $\beta \in S^1$. Therefore $h = \psi^{-1} \circ R_\beta \circ \varphi$, which is an absolutely continuous map. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Corollary 1.8. The proof follows easily from Corollary 1.7 by taking g the rotation $R_{\rho(f)}$. □

References

1. A. Adouani, H. Marzougui, *Sur les Homéomorphismes du cercle de classe P C^r par morceaux ($r \geq 1$) qui sont conjugués C^r par morceaux aux rotations irrationnelles*, Ann. Inst. Fourier, **58** (2008), 755–775.
2. A. Adouani, H. Marzougui, *Singular measures for class P-circle homeomorphisms with several break points*, Ergod. Th. and Dynam. Sys., **34** (2014), 423–456.
3. A. Adouani; H. Marzougui, *A sharp smoothness of the conjugation of Class P-homeomorphisms to diffeomorphisms.*, Kodai Math J., to appear, (2015).
4. A. Adouani, *Conjugation between circle maps with several break points*, Ergod. Th. and Dynam. Sys. (First published online 2015), doi:10.1017/etds.2015.32
5. H. Akhadkulov, A. Dzhalilov, Mohd Salmi Md. Noorani, *On conjugacies between piecewise-smooth circle maps*, Nonlinear Analysis **99** (2014), 1–15.
6. Kh.A. Akhadkulov, *Some circle homeomorphisms with break-type singularities*, Russian Math. Surveys **61**:5 (2006), 981–983.
7. H. Akhadkulov, A. Dzhalilov, D. Mayer, *On conjugations of circle homeomorphisms with two break points*, Ergod. Th. and Dynam. Sys., **34** (2014), 725–741.
8. K. Cunha, D. Smania, *Rigidity for piecewise smooth homeomorphisms on the circle*, Adv. Math., **250** (2014), 193–226.
9. W. de Melo, S. van Strien, One-Dimensional Dynamics, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, vol. 25, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.
10. A. Denjoy, *Sur les courbes définies par les équations differentielles à la surface du tore*, J. Math. Pures Appl., **11**, (1932), 333–375.
11. A. Dzhalilov, H. Akin, S. Temir, *Conjugations between circle maps with a single break point*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **366** (2010), 1–10.
12. A. Dzhalilov, D. Mayer and U. Safarov, *On the conjugation of piecewise smooth circle homeomorphisms with a finite number of break points*, Nonlinearity, **28** (2015), 2441–2459.
13. A. Finzi, *Sur le problème de la génération d'une transformation donnée d'une courbe fermée par une transformation infinitésimale*, Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup., 3^e série, **67** (1950), 243-305.

14. B. Hasselblatt, A. Katok, *Introduction to the Modern Theory of Dynamical Systems*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
15. E. Hewitt, K. Stromberg, Real and Abstract Analysis. Graduate text in Math. 25, Springer-Verlag, 1965.
16. M. Herman, *Sur la conjugaison différentiable des difféomorphismes du cercle à des rotations*, Pub. Math. Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci., **49** (1979), 5–234.
17. Y. Katznelson, D. Ornstein, *The differentiability of the conjugation of certain diffeomorphisms of the circle*, Ergod. Th. and Dynam. Sys., **9** (1989), 643–680.
18. K.M. Khanin, Ya.G. Sinai, *Smoothness of conjugacies of diffeomorphisms of the circle with rotations*, Russian Math. Surveys, **44** (1989), 69–99.
19. K.M. Khanin, A. Teplinsky, *Herman's theory revisited*, Invent. Math., **178** (2009), 333–344.
20. K. Khanin, A. Teplinsky, *Renormalization horseshoe and rigidity theory for circle diffeomorphisms with breaks*, Commun. Math. Phys., **320** (2013), 347–377.
21. K.M. Khanin, D. Khmelev, *Renormalizations and rigidity theory for circle homeomorphisms with singularities of the break type*. Commun. Math. Phys., **235** (2003), 69–124.
22. A. Navas, Groups of circle diffeomorphisms, Chicago Lectures in Mathematics. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 2011.
23. H. Poincaré, *Sur les courbes définies par les équations différentielles*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **1** (1885), 167–244.
24. Y.G. Sinai. Topics in Ergodic Theory, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1994.
25. A. Teplinsky, *A circle diffeomorphism with breaks that is smoothly linearizable*, Arxiv: 1506.06617 (2015).
26. J.C. Yoccoz, *Il n' y a pas de contre-exemple de Denjoy analytique*. C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, **298** (serie I), (1984), 141–144.

University of Carthage, Faculty of Science of Bizerte, Department of Mathematics, Jarzouna, 7021, Tunisia

E-mail address: arbi.abdelhamid@gmail.com

E-mail address: hmarzoug@ictp.it, habib.marzougui@fsb.rnu.tn